


NUNC COGNOSCO EX PARTE



TRENT UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2019 with funding from
Kahle/Austin Foundation

La

Société

Historique

du Canada

RAPPORT 1959

**de l'assemblée annuelle tenue à Saskatoon
les 3-6 juin de cette année**

Contenant les

Communications historiques

La Rédaction : DAVID SHADD

et PAUL E. DUMAS

The Canadian Historical Association La Société Historique du Canada

1959-1960

OFFICERS — OFFICIERS

Honorary President — Président honoraire
HIS EXCELLENCY THE RIGHT HONOURABLE
VINCENT MASSEY, C.H.
Governor General of Canada

President — Président
W. L. MORTON
Winnipeg, Man.

Vice President — Vice-président
W. K. FERGUSON
London, Ont.

English Language Secretary — Secrétaire de langue anglaise
G. W. L. NICHOLSON
Ottawa, Ont.

French Language Secretary — Secrétaire de langue française
R.P. ADRIEN POULIOT, S.J.
Québec, P.Q.

Treasurer — Trésorier
R. S. GORDON
Ottawa, Ont.

COUNCIL — CONSEIL

Past Presidents — Anciens présidents

Rt. Rev. A. D'ESCHAMBAULT
Gentson, Man.

W. KAYE LAMB
Ottawa, Ont.

Retiring — Jusqu'en 1960

H. B. NEATBY
Ottawa, Ont.

H. W. McCREADY
Hamilton, Ont.

Abbé H. PROVOST
Québec, P.Q.

E. C. WRIGHT
Ottawa, Ont.

Retiring — Jusqu'en 1961

P. G. CORNELL
Wolfville, N.S.

G. M. CRAIG
Toronto, Ont.

FERNAND OUELLET
Québec, P.Q.

L. G. THOMAS
Edmonton, Alta.

Retiring — Jusqu'en 1962

J.-C. BONENFANT
Québec, P.Q.

D. M. L. FARR
Ottawa, Ont.

Rev. D. J. MULVIHILL
Windsor, Ont.

M. A. ORMSBY
Vancouver, B.C.

Editor — Canadian Historical Review — Rédacteur
JOHN T. SAYWELL, Toronto, Ont.

Editor of the Report 1959 — Rédacteur du Rapport 1959
DAVID SHADD, Ottawa, Ont.

Associate Editor — Rédacteur adjoint
PAUL E. DUMAS, Ottawa, Ont.

CONTENTS — TABLE DES MATIÈRES

PAGE

Generals and Generalship before Quebec, 1759-60, by Col. C. P. STACEY	1
Le rôle des métropoles et des entrepreneurs dans la colonisation de l'Amérique et la mise en valeur de la vallée du Saint-Laurent, par MICHEL BRUNET	16
The Age of the Gregorian Reform and the Investiture Controversy, by NORMAN F. CANTOR	22
The Idea of Art as Propaganda in the French Revolution, by JAMES A. LEITH	30
Colonies Ripe for Revolt : The Older British North American Colonies, 1763, by LAWRENCE H. GIPSON	44
British and Indian Attitudes to the Indian Problem at the end of the Nineteenth Century, by P. HARNETTY	48
National Historic Parks and Sites, by the National Historic Sites Division, National Parks Branch, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources	63
Reports :	
Report of the Secretary, by G. W. L. NICHOLSON	71
Report of Local History Section, by MARGARET A. ORMSBY	74
Report of Archives Section, by EVELYN EAGER	75
Report of Treasurer, by ROBERT S. GORDON	76
Personal Notes Personnelles	78
List of Members and Affiliated Organizations — Liste des membres et des organisations affiliées	80

Articles in the Canadian Historical Association *Report* are indexed in the *Canadian Index*.

GENERALS AND GENERALSHIP BEFORE QUEBEC 1759-1760

Colonel C. P. STACEY
Historical Section, Army Headquarters, Ottawa

I

The two hundredth anniversary of the fall of Quebec is a good time for Canadian historians to take stock of the most famous series of events in Canadian history. After two centuries, these events are still, apparently, interesting to the public. At any rate, publishers seem to think so; for about half a dozen new books about them are being published in 1959.¹

There is an enormous literature about the Seven Years' War in America, and the Quebec campaign of 1759 in particular. In spite of this, many aspects of the period remain controversial. I shall today attempt a review of some of the controversies. But as a preliminary it seems desirable to review also the work of the historians who have contributed to them. Both things I propose to do in the light of a re-examination of the primary sources of information.

If I may begin with a personal explanation, some time ago I set out to write a short book on the events at Quebec in 1759. With what seems to me now considerable simplicity, I assumed that so much work had been done on these events that I could avoid doing much tiresome research and concentrate on producing a leisured and gentlemanly commentary on the well-established facts. Before I had done much reading I discovered that I had been too optimistic. I found myself driven on to start digging into the primary sources — a process rendered fatally easy by the fact that I was living in Ottawa, which possesses the greatest existing collection of such sources on the subject. In the end, I wrote, not the essay I had hoped for, but a documented history of the campaign, an attempt, however inadequate, at a new interpretation based on a new study of the contemporary evidence. I had come to feel, rightly or wrongly, that this was needed.

II

As a result of my reading I arrived at two disturbing conclusions. The first was that the history of the siege of Quebec had been, on the

¹ This paper is a by-product of a book by the author entitled *Quebec, 1759 : The Siege and the Battle*, published in September 1959 by The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited. Since the book is fully documented, some documentation which would otherwise have been necessary has been dispensed with here.

whole, rather badly written. The second, I am sorry to say, was that the worst of the bad writing had been done in Canada.

Whatever the political, social or economic historian may say, military operations are not the easiest stuff of which to make history. The fog of war has a way of drifting into the historian's study and getting into his eyes; and when to the grey fog of war is added the golden haze of romance, visibility tends to fall close to zero. The haze of romance settled over the Quebec area within a few weeks of the Battle of the Plains of Abraham, and it has not lifted yet. A good deal of what has been scribbled in the resulting murk seems to me not much better than romantic nonsense.

Prejudice, of course, has played a great part in the result. The influence of national prejudice is obvious. But there has been much personal prejudice too. Historians have become devoted adherents or bitter opponents of the leading personalities of the time. Moreover, some of them have suffered woefully from lack of military knowledge. Finally, there has been a considerable amount of just plain inadequate investigation. Writers of high reputation have been guilty of surprising lapses. I offer one example.

Sir Julian Corbett's book *England in the Seven Years' War* is regarded, not without some reason, as a standard military study of the war. In discussing the appointment of Wolfe to command the Quebec expedition, Corbett asserts that the Army in America had asked for him. There is in the Record Office, he says, a "curious paper" in which three colonels (Monckton, Murray and Burton) recommended to Pitt that he appoint Wolfe. This seemed decidedly "curious", even in the eighteenth century, and with the aid of Mr. Ormsby of the Public Archives I checked the source cited by Corbett. It turned out to be a document sent, not from America to England, but in the opposite direction; it is in fact the "Proposals for the Expedition to Quebec" sent by Pitt to General Amherst for his guidance.² It begins by noting that Colonel Wolfe is to command, with the rank of major general "for and during the Expedition to Quebec only"; it then goes on to list as "Brigadiers to Act under the same Restrictions" the names of Monckton, Murray and Burton. Incredible as it may seem, there appears to be no doubt that Corbett read these three names as *signatures* to the document. This led him, not only to perpetrate an historical absurdity, but to miss a point of much interest. This is the fact that Ralph Burton was originally slated to be the third brigadier, but was displaced, in circumstances which remain rather obscure, by the better-connected George Townshend. Townshend

² Corbett, *England in the Seven Years' War* (2 vols., London, 1907), I, 398. Public Record Office, London, C.O. 5/213 (transcript, Public Archives of Canada).

was evidently forced upon Wolfe.³ Here we have, one suspects, part of the background for the serious rift that developed between Wolfe and Townshend before Quebec.

This example at least serves to indicate that not all the historiographical crimes in connection with the 1759 campaign have been committed by Canadians. The Canadians, however, have been responsible for more than their fair share. It is particularly astonishing that they have failed to make better use of the plans of Quebec available in the Ottawa archives. Nothing of the slightest value has ever been done on the state of the Quebec fortifications in 1759, though ample material lies ready to hand. The late Sir Arthur Doughty gave currency to the legend that there are no defensive works at Quebec today which antedate 1820 — though a mere glance at the plans immediately establishes the fact that, basically, the city walls today are the same that stood there in 1759. Sir Arthur also accepted as an accurate account of the fortifications the plan drawn by Patrick Mackellar (Wolfe's Chief Engineer) after his captivity at Quebec in 1757. Yet the defences on the land side in Mackellar's plan are those shown on Charlevoix's map of 1744. These were in fact wholly altered beginning in 1745. Mackellar's plan was thus fourteen years out of date in 1759.⁴ It was lucky for Wolfe that, thanks to the inefficiency of the engineers and administrators of New France, the new fortifications were about as bad as the old ones; and Mackellar's basic conclusion, that the best way to take the city was to attack its weak land side, remained sound, even though the information on which it was based was entirely inaccurate.

Of the individual historians who have written about the events of 1759 one could speak endlessly. Leaving earlier writers aside, we may begin with Parkman. It seems to me that *Montcalm and Wolfe*, published in 1884, has worn remarkably well. There is not much that his successors can teach the Bostonian; on the contrary, many of them could learn from him. It is true that he tells some stories (which incidentally have been repeated by virtually every writer since his time) which are probably unfounded. It is true that he takes liberties with documents⁵ — though never, so far as I have seen, to the extent of altering the sense. Also,

³ See Wolfe to Townshend, 6 Jan. 1759, Beckles Willson, *The Life and Letters of James Wolfe* (London, 1909), 414. Cf. Rex Whitworth, *Field-Marshal Lord Ligonier* (London, 1958), 278-80. Von Ruville in his *William Pitt, Earl of Chatham* (3 vols., London, 1907) notes that Burton was passed over; but his comment is not perceptive (II, 262, n.).

⁴ It is reproduced in A.G. Doughty's edition of Knox's *Historical Journal of the Campaigns in North America* (3 vols., Toronto, 1914-16), III, opposite p. 150. It should be compared with the subsequent *Plan of the Town of Quebec...*, also signed by Mackellar (P.A.C.)

⁵ E.g., the version of Vaudreuil's letter to Bourlamaque, 6 Aug. 1759 (Bourlamaque Papers, P.A.C.) printed in *Montcalm and Wolfe* (ed. 1910, III, 75) in inverted commas, is not a quotation but a very free paraphrase.

his account of the Quebec campaign is relatively brief, and much is left out. But on balance one can only salute him for his achievement.

Among the other writers who have dealt broadly with the Seven Years' War, and more incidentally with the Quebec campaign, Richard Waddington is an eminent figure. *La Guerre de sept ans*, so far as I can judge it, is a book impressive in research as well as monumental in scope. And it is pleasant to be able to say that North American scholarship in our own day has produced a work worthy to stand beside these triumphs of the past. Professor Gipson's book *The Great War for the Empire*, a part of his larger work, *The British Empire before the American Revolution*, is fine in its sweep and most admirable in its investigation of the sources. I would not agree with everything in it, but it is a splendid achievement of the historian's craft.

I turn now to the more specialized studies, and first to the group of Canadian historians who laboured in the field in the late Victorian period and early in the present century. Among the French-speaking scholars of this period the dominant figure was the Abbé H.-R. Casgrain. Following in the footsteps of Garneau, he interpreted the war of the conquest in terms of French-Canadian nationalism. This appears particularly in his championship of Vaudreuil, who, it may be recalled, was Canada's first native-born Governor General. The eighteenth-century division between the French of France and the French of Canada is reflected and paralleled in the nineteenth-century bickering between Casgrain and René de Kerallain, the biographer of Bougainville. De Kerallain observed, "L'abbé Casgrain appartient à la catégorie des écrivains patriotes; et, quand le patriote se double d'un Canadien, son patriotisme est deux fois plus nerveux." ⁶

Casgrain's great achievement is, of course, his edition of the Lévis Papers, a vastly important group of documents.⁷ Since the original manuscripts are now in the Public Archives of Canada, it is possible to assess the value of the published version. It is certainly a most useful contribution. The documents which Casgrain did not publish are relatively few and unimportant. The transcription does not meet the meticulous standards of modern scholarship, but it is broadly accurate. Occasionally, it is true, Casgrain's transcriber made a real howler. Again one example, from the account of the Battle of the Plains in the journal called Montcalm's. The author of this part of the journal, apparently the artillery officer Montbeillard, describes a conversation with Montcalm just before the fatal attack. The Casgrain version makes the general say, "If we give him time to establish himself, we shall never be able to

⁶ See De Kerallain's *La Jeunesse de Bougainville et la guerre de sept ans* (Paris, 1896), 7.

⁷ *Collection des Manuscrits du Maréchal de Lévis* (12 vols., Montreal and Quebec, 1889-95).

attack him with the few troops we have (*le peu de troupes que nous avons*).” But the phrase in the manuscript is clearly not “le peu de troupes” but “L’Espèce de troupes” — *the kind of troops* we have.⁸ Fortunately, errors as bad as this are not frequent, and I must say that I should hate to have to pick my way through the Lévis manuscripts without the guidance of Casgrain’s printed edition.

The most famous monument of English-Canadian scholarship in this field is the six volumes of Doughty’s *The Siege of Quebec and the Battle of the Plains of Abraham*, published in collaboration with G.W. Parmelee in 1901. This book is partly a history, partly a collection of documents. The documents are — with some reservations — invaluable. The history belongs in a lower category. Doughty was one of those whose vision was seriously affected by the golden haze. He had a romantic regard for both Wolfe and Montcalm, and even for that versatile but inefficient soldier Bougainville. His knowledge of the Casgrain documents — a comparatively recent publication in his time — seems to have been imperfect. He devotes some indignation to the purblind people who insist on suggesting that Bougainville was at Cap Rouge on the eventful night of the 12th-13th September 1759, and produces some second-hand evidence to indicate that he was not there.⁹ Yet Casgrain had published the only letter by Bougainville himself describing that night. Bougainville wrote to Bourlamaque, “Un homme se laisse surprendre à l’anse des Mères; je suis au cap Rouge.”¹⁰ Doughty, like some other partisans of Wolfe, convinced himself, in spite of the absence of any real evidence whatever, that Wolfe had in mind from the beginning the landing at the Anse au Foulon which was finally executed on 13 September.¹¹

Even the documents Doughty presents, invaluable as they are, have to be treated with some reserve. I was surprised to discover that two paragraphs which the British government censored out of Wolfe’s famous dispatch to Pitt when it was first published in 1759 are still missing from Doughty’s version, as they are from almost every version in print. I found also that part of Wolfe’s almost equally famous and informative letter to Admiral Saunders written on 31 August 1759 is missing from Doughty’s text.¹²

A writer at least as influential in Canada as Doughty was Colonel William Wood, author of *The Fight for Canada* and several volumes in the “Chronicles of Canada” series. Wood was a devoted worker in Canadian military history, and it is not pleasant to have to depreciate

⁸ *Ibid.*, [VII], 612. MS of Montcalm journal, Lévis Papers, P.A.C.

⁹ *The Siege of Quebec*, III, 107.

¹⁰ *Collection des Manuscrits du Maréchal de Lévis*, [V], 357 (18 Sept. 1759).

¹¹ *The Siege of Quebec*, III, 301.

¹² The dispatch to Pitt is published in full in Kimball. The letter to Saunders was published in *Gentleman’s Magazine*, June 1801. For Doughty’s version, published he says “in full”, see *The Siege of Quebec*, II, 151-4.

his writings; but his influence, so far as the Seven Years' War is concerned, has been most unfortunate. He was an amateur soldier and an amateur historian, but he has been regarded by the authors of general histories of Canada as a reliable guide through the complexities of the Quebec campaigns. The results have been regrettable. Wood's predilections and prejudices were much the same as Doughty's: a romantic regard for both Wolfe and Montcalm, a deep hostility to Vaudreuil. How far his interpretation was really based on documents can be judged from the fact that he changed it late in life and published an account of Wolfe far less favourable to the general than the eulogistic one presented in *The Fight for Canada* some twenty years before.¹³

The fact is that Wood's work abounds in errors, major and minor. It would be no trick to compile a very long list of them. Perhaps the most egregious was his attribution to Vaudreuil of the phrase, "There is no need to believe that the English have wings", which was actually written to Vaudreuil by Montcalm on 29 July.¹⁴ In *The Passing of New France*¹⁵ Wood dramatically represents Vaudreuil as making this remark to Montcalm on 12 September, "Raising his voice so that the staff could hear him." An author who is capable of this is capable of practically anything. Wood popularized the story of Vaudreuil's countermanding Montcalm's order moving the Guyenne battalion to the site of Wolfe's landing the night before the Battle of the Plains, though as I have tried to show elsewhere the evidence for this is extraordinarily slight.¹⁶ He did not even know Wolfe's actual rank in the Army — having apparently not discovered the *Army List*.¹⁷ He asserts that books contain statements which, on inspection, turn out to be not there.¹⁸

Wood's works are less well known outside than inside Canada — and the writing done outside is none the worse for this, though it is worth remarking that British and American writers have neglected his useful compilation *The Logs of the Conquest of Canada* as much as his less valuable works. But Canadian writers have tended to swallow him whole. Evidence of his prestige is the fact that even so thorough and reliable an historian as Professor Creighton clearly relied on Wood as a basis for the pages on the 1759 campaign in *Dominion of the North*. The result is that he repeated a succession of unfounded tales, including the inherently impossible one (also in Parkman and many other books) of the Highland officer who answered the sentry's question about his

¹³ *Unique Quebec* (Literary and Historical Society of Quebec, 1924).

¹⁴ Letter of 29 July 1759, appended to Vaudreuil to the Minister, 5 Oct. 1759, P.A.C., F 3, vol. 15.

¹⁵ Toronto, 1920 (Chronicles of Canada), 128.

¹⁶ "The Anse au Foulon, 1759: Montcalm and Vaudreuil" (*Canadian Historical Review*, March 1959).

¹⁷ *The Fight for Canada* (ed. Boston, 1906), 142-3, 145. Wood calls Wolfe "a regimental lieutenant-colonel", but he had been Colonel of the 67th Foot since 1757.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 334, re Robert Stobo's *Memoirs*.

regiment with the words "De La Reine",¹⁹ and the oft-printed detail of the Royal-Roussillon battalion marching on to the battlefield "in its distinctive blue". (Royal-Roussillon, like all the other French regiments in Canada, wore white.)²⁰

Two Canadian biographies, both old books now, may be mentioned. Sir Thomas Chapais was devoted to his subject, as biographers tend to be; yet his life of Montcalm is distinguished by considerable objectivity as well as by careful research. W. T. Waugh's *James Wolfe, Man and Soldier*, on the other hand, is one of the romantic works, ready to take leave of the documents at any time to achieve an interpretation favourable to his hero. (Read his account of the correspondence between Wolfe and the brigadiers at the end of August 1759.)

A quite different approach to Wolfe, however, was that of Waugh's McGill colleague, Professor Adair, in his presidential address to this association in 1936.²¹ This was a realistic re-interpretation based on careful examination of a wide range of sources. It may be called, in fact, the most thorough account that could be compiled within the city limits of Montreal. I find myself of the opinion that Mr. Adair somewhat overdid his onslaught on Wolfe's reputation; he was not without prejudice against Vaudreuil; but his paper was certainly the most significant Canadian contribution to the subject and, in spite of its exaggerations, possibly the best thing on Wolfe ever written anywhere. More recently an eminent French-Canadian scholar, Mr. Frégault, has given us a full-length book on the Seven Years' War in America.²² Like so many earlier works written in Quebec, it presents a nationalistic view favourable to Vaudreuil. It is distinguished, however, by its careful use of primary sources in both French and English. On matters of fact, Professor Frégault's narrative is almost always firmly grounded; as to his interpretation of the facts, there is almost always room for discussion. Unfortunately, although he goes into great detail about the operations at Oswego in 1756, he has comparatively little to say about the much more important ones at Quebec three years later.

Finally, a general word about document collections. My initial assumption that everything important was in print turned out to be unjustified. I have spoken of Casgrain and Doughty. The other basic collection is that of Gertrude S. Kimball, *Correspondence of William Pitt... with Colonial Governors and Military and Naval Commanders in America*.²³ This has the virtue that the text of the letters is accurately

¹⁹ This battalion was with Bourlamaque on Lake Champlain. And no French sentry would have asked such a question. Transport was no task for regular troops.

²⁰ *Etat Militaire de France, pour l'année 1759...* (Paris, 1759), 228.

²¹ "The Military Reputation of Major-General James Wolfe", Canadian Historical Association Report, 1936.

²² *La Guerre de la conquête* (Montréal, 1955).

²³ 2 vols., New York, 1906.

transcribed from the original manuscripts. But unfortunately none of the enclosures is printed; and often they are more important than the letter itself. The Kimball notes, moreover, have very little value.

Even at this late date, there are still significant documents that are not in print at all. A particularly striking example is Vaudreuil's long dispatch dated 5 October 1759 which is his description of the campaign and his *apologia* for the loss of Quebec.²⁴ A large number of very valuable papers are attached to it as appendices. I can only attribute the failure to print this document to the hostility to Vaudreuil which has been so evident among certain historians, including Doughty. Apparently it was considered that the governor was so prejudiced that it was unnecessary or undesirable to allow his views to go before the court.

III

With this background, we may pass on to discuss the much-controverted campaign of 1759.

To me, after a long period spent studying the documents, it seems that there was no really first-class military figure among the men present at Quebec on that famous occasion. The claims to genius made on behalf of both Wolfe and Montcalm have been advanced by writers unduly influenced by the romantic circumstances in which they fought and died. Both possessed military talents. Neither deserves to rank among the great captains of history. Montcalm's reputation has been gilded by a glorious failure and a gallant death, while Wolfe's has reflected the splendour of a famous victory which he apparently did not expect and probably did not deserve.

Pitt took a considerable chance when he appointed Wolfe to the Quebec expedition, for the young general had had no experience in independent command. And the campaign which he conducted during the summer of 1759, in spite of the success which finally crowned it, suggests that Wolfe was in fact unfitted for such command. Our knowledge of the development of his plans, though incomplete, is considerably improved by his letters to Monckton in the Northcliffe Collection at Ottawa,²⁵ which have not been used by his biographers or by any historian of the campaign. They serve further to document Wolfe's vacillations and uncertainties, which are already familiar to students and were emphasized by Adair. According to my calculation — and another person would probably arrive at another figure — Wolfe adopted and rejected seven different operational plans before finally settling upon the one which gave him his victory. To drag this audience through all the detail would be extreme cruelty; but I feel that I must at least attempt an outline.

²⁴ Above, note 14.

²⁵ Monckton Papers, vol. XXII.

Knowing before he reached Quebec that his basic problem was to get at the weak land side of the fortress, Wolfe's main idea was to seize and fortify the Beauport shore below the city, with a view to advancing thence across the St. Charles.²⁶ But when he landed on the Isle of Orleans on 27 June he at once discovered that Montcalm had anticipated him and had himself fortified that area. Wolfe's first plan was thus defeated. His second one, adopted on 3 July after consultation with Admiral Saunders, was to "get ashore if possible above the town".²⁷ To assist this scheme he proposed to bombard Quebec from the south shore of the St. Lawrence, and to make a landing below the Montmorency as a diversion. But by the 10th he had clearly abandoned this plan — probably partly because the Navy did not yet fully control the waters about Quebec, partly because of French military counter-moves — and had converted the Montmorency diversion into his main operation. On 16 July he outlined to Monckton in some detail a scheme for a frontal attack on the French entrenchments here.²⁸ This was his third plan. But on the night of 18-19 July a division of the fleet for the first time passed Quebec and got into upper river. Wolfe now, probably very wisely, switched back to that flank, abandoning the Montmorency scheme in favour of an enterprise above the town.

Early on the morning of 20 July he wrote Monckton ²⁹ at Point Lévis ordering him to cooperate in an attack that evening which was apparently to be directed at St. Michel, a short distance above the Anse au Foulon. Preparations went forward actively; but at 1 p.m. the same day Wolfe postponed the operation, apparently because the French, alarmed by the movement of the ships, were moving men and guns. He kept this hopeful fourth plan alive for some days, but by 25-6 July he had abandoned it and was back to the eastern flank, reconnoitring the crossings of the Montmorency. Getting no encouragement here, on the 28th he announced that he had decided on an attack on an outwork of the French Beauport position. A small redoubt on the beach, which Wolfe calculated was out of musket-shot of the French entrenchments, was to be captured and strengthened. The hope was that Montcalm would attack it and allow the British to fight a defensive action. Wolfe wrote, "I take it to be better that the Marquis shou'd attack a firm Corps of ours w^h superiority of numbers, than that we should attack his whole Army entrenched, w^h what we can put on shoar at one landing...." ³⁰

This was his fifth plan. He tried to carry it out on the eventful 31st of July. The first stage was to run a couple of armed vessels ashore

²⁶ Letter to Major Walter Wolfe, 19 May 1759, Willson, 427-9. This letter also refers to the possibility of entrenching a detachment *above* the town.

²⁷ Wolfe's Journal, McGill University version.

²⁸ Monckton Papers, XXII.

²⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁰ To Monckton, n.d. (29 July ?), *ibid.*

close to the redoubt. Wolfe boarded one of them to reconnoitre, and at once saw that his calculations had been at fault. The redoubt was closer to the entrenchments than he had believed, and would not be tenable under their fire. With the French shot flying about him, Wolfe made a reappraisal. He decided to go on with the operation; but now it took the form he had rejected a couple of days before — a frontal attack on the French army in its entrenchments, the circumstances in which the Canadian militia were most formidable. This was so fundamental a change that it deserves to be called his sixth plan. And the attack was a bloody failure.

A pause followed, during which Wolfe continued his incendiary bombardment of Quebec, and began systematically devastating the farming communities above and below the city. He hoped that this might goad Montcalm into coming out of his inaccessible entrenchments and attacking him; but "the Marquis" refused to be drawn. Then Wolfe fell ill; and in a famous memorandum he sought, belatedly, the advice of his three able brigadiers. He asked them to consider three possible plans of operations, all simply variants of the Montmorency attack that had failed on 31 July. In their forceful reply the brigadiers politely rejected all three and put their collective finger on the dominant fact of the strategic situation — the fact that there was virtually no food in Quebec, and that the garrison and the inhabitants were entirely dependent upon supplies brought in from the west. Cut that line of communication, and Montcalm would have to come out and fight. Their advice accordingly was, abandon the Montmorency position and concentrate the hitherto divided army for action above the town. It was excellent advice, and Wolfe took it.

By 7 September, accordingly, the main body of the army was embarked in the ships above Quebec. The brigadiers recommended a landing above Cap Rouge, in the St. Augustin — Pointe-aux-Trembles area, a dozen or more miles west of the city. Orders were issued for this operation, which we may term the seventh plan; and it came close to being executed on 8 September. But the weather broke; and before the rain stopped Wolfe changed his mind again. He had adopted, and kept to, the most vital features of the brigadiers' plan (a point which Doughty did not understand or appreciate); but on the important matter of choice of a landing-place he now took leave of it. What drew his attention to the Anse au Foulon we simply do not know;³¹ but he decided to land there, less than three miles from Quebec, at a point where the steepness

³¹ The statements of Doughty and Wood that Robert Stobo cannot have suggested it because he left Quebec on 7 September with dispatches for Amherst have no validity — for it was on the very next day that Wolfe (according to Townshend) "went a reconnoitring down the river" and may have first observed the Foulon path. Stobo might well have made the suggestion in a final interview. But there is no evidence for this.

of the cliffs would make an opposed landing impossible, and where the main French force was close at hand. The brigadiers' scheme offered the same strategic advantage — the cutting of the supply line from the west — with much less risk and better hope of a decisive result; for an army defeated near Pointe-aux-Trembles would have had fewer facilities for a withdrawal towards Montreal than one defeated on the Plains of Abraham. But fortune, which is said to favour the brave, favoured Wolfe; every break went his way; a plan whose success depended entirely upon luck was blessed with that commodity in unlimited quantities. To the last, indeed, Wolfe himself seems to have found it difficult to believe in his own good fortune. There is a fairly well authenticated story that after reaching the top of the cliff he sent Isaac Barré back to stop the landing until he could be quite certain that the French were not in the area in strength. Barré, finding that the "second flight" of troops were already offshore ready to land, simply refrained from delivering the order and allowed the landing to proceed.³²

These are not the actions of a great commander. As a strategist — a big word for such small operations, but it seems to be the only one — Wolfe was painfully inadequate. There is no military figure so ineffective as a general who cannot make up his mind. Wolfe was the last man who should have been trusted with an independent command. Moreover, he had defects of personality which made it difficult for him to work effectively with his senior subordinates. Two of his brigadiers came to detest him, and while we know little about his relations with the third, Monckton, we do know that the general wrote Monckton two letters apologizing for some slight and begging him not to turn against him.³³ Wolfe's journal contains strictures on the Navy which suggest that he was a difficult colleague; Admiral Saunders' opinion of him unfortunately seems not to have been recorded. Add to this the policy of deliberate terror which Wolfe applied against the city of Quebec and the neighbouring parishes, a policy which did little or nothing to advance his campaign, and we get a total picture which is not impressive.

Nevertheless, Wolfe was not without valuable military qualities. He was an uncommonly fine fighting officer, at his best under fire; and this accounts for his great reputation among the junior ranks of his army, who knew nothing of his deficiencies as a planner. Once the army was ashore at the Anse au Foulon no mistakes were made. Wolfe was as decisive on the battlefield as he had been indecisive through the long weeks when he was fumbling with his strategic problem. To say that he was no more than "a good regimental officer" is I think to underrate him. It would be truer to say that he had it in him to be a good

³² Henry Caldwell to James Murray, 1 Nov. 1772, Amherst Papers, Packet 28 (transcript, P.A.C.).

³³ 15 and 16 Aug. 1759, Monckton Papers, XXII.

tactician, capable of vigorous and effective leadership and control in action. Working under a higher commander who could prescribe his tasks, he would have been a very valuable officer. He could win a battle, though he could not plan a campaign.

IV

Let us turn to Montcalm. As a strategist he seems to me to have been superior to Wolfe. French-Canadian writers, including Professor Frégault, have criticized him for adopting so exclusively defensive a policy; but this was the policy suited to his means and his circumstances, and therefore it was right. He had more men than Wolfe, but they were largely amateurs, confronting an army of professionals. Under these conditions, it was in Wolfe's interest to bring on a battle in the open field, and in Montcalm's to avoid one. And time was on Montcalm's side. If he could only hold his position and avoid a disaster, the approach of winter would drive the British out of the St. Lawrence. The best tribute to the soundness of Montcalm's policy is Wolfe's letters and dispatches, which testify repeatedly to the manner in which he was frustrated by the French defences and Montcalm's determination to remain within them. Yet Montcalm had made a fundamental strategic error in keeping the French food supplies in depots up the river, and thereby rendering his force dependent from day to day on an exposed line of communication. The object was to enable the field army to retire westward, and still be fed, in case of the loss of Quebec; and it is apparent that it was almost an article of belief among the French that major units of the British fleet could not get past the city. But when this happened, and the British cut the line of communication, Montcalm's whole defensive policy fell to the ground and he had to risk a battle.

Montcalm lacked one invaluable ability which some fortunate generals have possessed. He had no flair for penetrating his adversary's intentions. To him, as apparently to everybody else in authority on the French side, the landing at the Foulon was a thunderbolt out of a clear sky. All the evidence indicates that to the last he thought Wolfe's most probable course was a blow at Beauport, with a landing far up the river as second choice. And it is not to Montcalm's credit as a commander that he failed to observe the possibilities of the Foulon track — which offered a perfectly good means of moving cannon up from the river to the heights west of the city.

Montcalm, as has often been recognized, committed a serious tactical error on the battlefield. He certainly had to attack, to clear his line of communication; but he did not have to attack at ten o'clock in the morning instead of a few hours later. As I already mentioned, he feared that the British would soon establish themselves too firmly to be evicted; and with what seems to have been characteristic impulsiveness he launched

his assault without waiting for Colonel de Bougainville, who was only a few miles away and had the best troops in the French army with him. He thus threw away his best hope of victory.

Like Wolfe, Montcalm had defects of temperament which affected his military usefulness. His feud with Vaudreuil is well known. The pompous Governor undoubtedly gave him provocation, but Montcalm's own journal provides evidence that the general had a rather low boiling-point. I suspect that the same nervous impatience that drove him on to the premature attack on 13 September made it difficult for him to bear with Vaudreuil. The discord between the two men was a misfortune for New France, though its military effects have probably been somewhat exaggerated. The French Court ought to have removed one or the other. A proposal was in fact made at the end of 1758 to relieve Montcalm, replacing him with the Chevalier de Lévis; but the King seems to have decided against it. The decision was probably unfortunate, for it was important to restore concord to the colony, and Lévis, certainly a soldier of ability, would doubtless have conducted the defence as well as Montcalm did.

V

The more one considers the campaign of 1759, the more the conclusion emerges that the decisive factor in the result was not superior British generalship but the superior efficiency of the British forces. The professionals beat the amateurs, as they usually do. British sea power was of course the basic strategic determinant, but in addition the presence of a large and efficient British fleet before Quebec had enormous influence on the tactical operations. As for the military forces, the British superiority in quality, evident throughout the campaign, appears with special clarity in the final crisis of 13 September. The British tactical plan for the approach and landing at the Anse au Foulon, excellent in itself, was executed by the Navy with a skill which it requires some study of combined operations to appreciate. The same boats landed three flights of troops in rapid succession. The one hitch — the fact that the tide carried the first flight some distance below the intended point of landing — was offset by the resourcefulness of Lt.-Col. William Howe, who led his light infantrymen straight up the cliff before them, an athletic feat which was I believe no part of Wolfe's plan.

By comparison, the picture on the French side is one of extreme disorganization, beginning with the extraordinary fact that after ordering a movement of provision boats, and warning their posts to pass them through, the French authorities cancelled the movement without informing the posts. Everything else was of a piece with this. Control, communication and vigilance were all lacking, with the result that at dawn, when the British army was pouring ashore at the Foulon, the French army,

having manned its Beauport entrenchments much of the night, was retiring to its tents. In the actual encounter on the Plains, the result was clearly due to superior British discipline and training. The weak French regular battalions had been heavily diluted with militia, and the attackers were falling into hopeless disorder long before the British fired a musket-shot at them.³⁴ Wolfe had assumed with the utmost confidence that his highly-trained professional soldiers would have an easy victory if the French could only be brought to action in the open; and the result justified his calculations.

VI

The Battle of the Plains was only half a victory: partly because of the plan Wolfe had adopted, which gave the French the chance of retiring behind the St. Charles River and getting away to the west by way of Charlesbourg and the Lorettes, and partly perhaps because of Wolfe's own death, which deprived the British of effective higher leading at a moment when a skilful and energetic tactician might possibly have made the triumph really complete. The result was that the British got Quebec, but the French field army remained in being, and another year's campaign was needed to destroy that army and end the war in Canada. About the 1760 campaign I propose to say only a few words.

The French position this year was hopeless, first because the Court of Versailles sent inadequate assistance, and secondly because the assistance it sent never reached its destination — since in 1760 the British fleet got into the St. Lawrence first. But the campaign conducted by Lévis and Vaudreuil in the hope of large-scale help from France was both a valiant adventure and a skilful strategic performance. The popular French-Canadian legend of this campaign and in particular of its chief incident, the defeat of Murray in the so-called Battle of Ste. Foy on 28 April, seems to be that it was an improvised effort carried out with inadequate means largely by the Canadian militia. The material means available to Lévis were certainly pitifully inadequate, but it would be an error to assume that at Ste. Foy the British regulars were defeated by the Canadian amateurs. In this battle, as in the one in the previous September, the professional soldier was the essential figure. Montcalm in the Battle of the Plains had five battalions of the *troupes de terre*. Lévis at Ste. Foy had eight (less detachments spared for Lake Champlain), three of them having been virtually unengaged in 1759. The total force collected for his expedition was just under 7,000 men, including 3,889 regulars, while Murray reports that he himself had 3,866 officers and men in the battle.³⁵ Thus Lévis had almost exactly the same number of

³⁴ See, e.g., Malartic to Bourlamaque, 28 Sept. 1759, Bourlamaque Papers, *Variarum*, P.A.C.

³⁵ Lévis' Journal, April 1760, *Collection des Manuscrits*, I; strength return, *ibid.*, 257. Murray's dispatch to Pitt, 25 May 1760, C.O. 5/64.

regulars as Murray, plus his 3,000 militiamen as a bonus. Taking a "calculated risk" with respect to other fronts, he had effected a powerful concentration before Quebec.

Murray has been criticized for abandoning his excellent defensive position outside the walls of Quebec in order to attack Lévis. The criticism is probably just, for in the presence of so superior an enemy a defensive battle was Murray's best chance for a victory. Nevertheless, he came closer to winning than has been generally recognized. He explains that, reconnoitring the French, he "preceiv'd their Van busy throwing up Redoubts while their Main body was yet on their march"; and he attempted "to attack them before they could have time to Form".³⁶ Snow and mud hindered the movement of his guns. Yet it was a very near thing — so near that Lévis momentarily lost his nerve, decided that his troops were not going to succeed in forming and ordered the abandonment of a vital position on the left flank. The day was saved for the French by Lt.-Col. Dalquier, commanding the La Sarre brigade in this sector. Estimating the situation more accurately than Lévis, he took it on himself to countermand the general's order and led his men to the attack. Subsequently Lévis thanked him for this timely disobedience.³⁷ Since both the opposing commanders made serious miscalculations, the level of generalship at Ste. Foy cannot be said to have been particularly high.

* * *

What can one say in conclusion? Reviewing these great events of two centuries ago, and what has been written about them, it is hard to take much pride in our historiography. To a large extent, the chief actors have been interpreted in the light of prejudice and sentimentality. They have been made romantic heroes or villains rather than human beings to be studied on the basis of the records. Historians have approached the men and events of the time with their minds already made up, and have looked to the documents for evidence to bolster up their preconceptions rather than for facts to enable them to arrive at an objective appraisal. In his presidential address last year Dr. Lamb quietly made the devastating remark, "Real accuracy in Canadian historical writing is rare." Many of the histories of the conquest of Canada illustrate this observation only too forcibly. Much remains to be done in Canadian history. Unfortunately also, it appears that a good deal is going to have to be done over again.

³⁶ Murray's Journal, 28 Apr. 1760 (photostat, P.A.C.).

³⁷ Lt.-Gen. le Comte de Maurès de Malartic, *Journal des Campagnes au Canada de 1755 à 1760* (Paris, 1890), 317. Cf. Bourlamaque to Bougainville, 3 May 1760, de Kerallain, *La Jeunesse de Bougainville*, 167.

LE RÔLE DES MÉTROPOLIS ET DES ENTREPRENEURS DANS LA COLONISATION DE L'AMÉRIQUE ET LA MISE EN VALEUR DE LA VALLÉE DU SAINT-LAURENT

MICHEL BRUNET
Université de Montréal

On a dit avec raison qu'il faut continuellement récrire l'histoire. En effet, notre connaissance du passé — qui ne sera toujours que fragmentaire — s'élargit dans la mesure où chaque génération d'historiens s'efforce de mieux comprendre les phénomènes politiques, économiques et sociaux de son époque. Les progrès constants de la science économique, de la science politique et de la sociologie donnent aux historiens les moyens de jeter une lumière nouvelle sur la formation et l'évolution des sociétés qui font l'objet de leurs études et de leurs recherches.

En cette deuxième moitié du XX^e siècle, l'historien de la colonisation de l'Amérique dispose de données que n'avaient pas ses prédécesseurs. L'Œuvre colonisatrice qui se poursuit, depuis la fin de la deuxième guerre mondiale, dans les pays sous-développés a révélé à quelles conditions ceux-ci parviendront à s'équiper et à être mis en valeur. Les peuples pauvres ne sortiront de leur misère que s'ils bénéficient du surplus économique des pays fortunés et se dotent d'une élite de spécialistes dévoués à leur progrès et à leur bien-être. Ils ont besoin d'une aide extérieure et doivent pouvoir compter sur l'initiative éclairée de leurs classes dirigeantes.

* * *

La situation n'était pas différente à l'époque où l'Europe occidentale colonisa l'Amérique. Les colonies de peuplement que fondèrent l'Espagne, le Portugal, l'Angleterre et la France furent toutes à l'origine des sociétés sous-développées. Plusieurs d'entre elles, moins fortunées que les Etats-Unis et le Canada anglais, le sont demeurées jusqu'à nos jours. Il serait trop long d'expliquer pourquoi il en a été ainsi. Ce qu'il importe de retenir c'est que les colonies espagnoles, anglaises et françaises ont pris naissance dans des circonstances identiques même si leur évolution historique a été ensuite différente.

En fondant des colonies, l'Espagne, le Portugal, l'Angleterre et la France obéirent aux mêmes motifs, répondirent aux mêmes besoins, subirent les mêmes impulsions et poursuivirent les mêmes buts. Ils désiraient étendre leurs voies commerciales, obtenir de nouveaux produits, découvrir des métaux précieux, offrir de nouveaux canaux de promotion

à leurs classes dirigeantes et augmenter leur puissance en devenant maîtres de territoires situés outre-mer. Ceux-ci se peuplèrent d'immigrants venus de la mère-patrie et devinrent partie intégrante des empires qui les colonisèrent. Cette colonisation fut une œuvre lente qui s'est réalisée graduellement jusqu'au XX^e siècle. Dès les débuts, elle reposa sur l'action dynamique d'un ensemble de facteurs parmi lesquels il faut surtout mettre en évidence le rôle des métropoles et celui des entrepreneurs.

Les luttes des anciennes colonies contre leurs mères-patries, en particulier la Guerre de l'Indépendance et le soulèvement de l'Amérique latine au XIX^e siècle, ont faussé la perspective des auteurs qui ont étudié l'histoire de la colonisation de l'Amérique. Trop souvent, les historiens, victimes de la propagande patriotique des chefs révolutionnaires et aveuglés par leur nationalisme, ont sous-évalué la contribution des métropoles à l'établissement et au développement des sociétés coloniales. Parfois, ils ont même prétendu que les métropoles avaient retardé le progrès des nations qu'elles avaient créées. Une étude plus objective de la colonisation démontre que les colonies ont, en général, reçu de leurs mères-patries beaucoup plus qu'elles ne leur ont donné. La métropole nourricière fournit à la société coloniale qu'elle fonde (il n'est ici question que de colonies de peuplement) tout ce dont celle-ci a besoin pour se développer normalement : des immigrants, des éducateurs, des techniciens, des administrateurs, des institutions politiques, des traditions, des capitaux et des marchés. Son surplus économique est au service de sa colonie. Elle la protège contre ses ennemis. Elle porte une partie du fardeau de son administration. Elle la guide vers la maturité. Toutes les métropoles n'ont pas pu jouer intégralement leur rôle, mais chacune d'entre elles a sincèrement cherché à s'en acquitter.

Parmi toutes les nations colonisatrices de l'Amérique, l'Angleterre demeure celle qui a le mieux réussi. Les circonstances l'ont certainement aidée, mais son succès fut aussi la récompense des efforts et des sacrifices consentis. Pourra-t-on jamais évaluer quelle a été la contribution de la Grande-Bretagne à l'équipement et au progrès de la nation américaine ? Durant la période coloniale, la mère-patrie veilla continuellement au bien-être de ses possessions d'Amérique. En temps de guerre, la marine et l'armée britanniques assuraient leur sécurité. Chaque année, pendant plus d'un siècle et demi, des immigrants et des capitaux anglais enrichirent les colonies. Souvent, le gouvernement impérial accorda des subventions spéciales aux producteurs américains. Le Parlement approuva le versement de primes alléchantes pour encourager la culture de l'indigotier dans les deux Carolines et en Georgie. Les produits forestiers américains exportés en Angleterre ne payaient aucun droit. L'Etat versait des primes aux producteurs de fournitures pour les constructions navales. Ce fut grâce aux contrats métropolitains que les chantiers

maritimes coloniaux se développèrent. Chaque fois qu'elle le pouvait sans nuire à ses relations commerciales avec les autres pays, l'Angleterre s'empressait de diminuer ou même de supprimer ses droits douaniers pour favoriser les exportations de ses coloniaux. Ceux-ci se rendirent vite compte, après l'Indépendance, des nombreux avantages économiques, culturels et autres qu'ils tiraient comme membres de l'empire britannique. Ils s'efforcèrent alors de renouer des relations profitables et régulières avec leur ancienne mère-patrie. Au XIX^e siècle, la Grande-Bretagne continua au bénéfice des Etats-Unis son ancien rôle de métropole nourricière, appelée à assister un pays sous-développé. Les universités et les collèges américains recrutèrent plusieurs de leurs professeurs au Royaume-Uni. Les capitalistes britanniques aidèrent les Américains à organiser leur système bancaire, à construire leurs canaux et leurs chemins de fer, à constituer leur équipement industriel. Depuis leur fondation jusqu'à la première grande guerre, les Etats-Unis ont profité du surplus économique de la Grande-Bretagne.

En plus de pouvoir compter sur l'appui d'une métropole nourricière, les colonies de peuplement de l'Amérique eurent à leur service une classe d'entrepreneurs. Ceux-ci se divisèrent en deux groupes: les entrepreneurs métropolitains et les entrepreneurs coloniaux. Tous les historiens reconnaissent que la bourgeoisie capitaliste, depuis la Renaissance jusqu'au XX^e siècle, a exercé une influence déterminante sur l'évolution du monde occidental. Ses intérêts et son ambition ont toujours favorisé l'expansion coloniale. Après l'Etat, elle fut le plus puissant agent colonisateur. Au Portugal et en Espagne, les banquiers, les armateurs et les négociants appuyèrent les entreprises d'exploration maritime et de colonisation. Des aventuriers de génie se joignirent à eux. Les colonies d'Amérique enrichirent plusieurs générations d'entrepreneurs portugais et espagnols.

En Angleterre, les hommes d'affaires furent les premiers à comprendre que leur pays devait fonder des colonies afin de résister à l'hégémonie espagnole et d'étendre le commerce britannique. Les capitalistes anglais financèrent des compagnies de commerce maritime et de colonisation dans le but de découvrir de nouveaux marchés et d'établir des colons en Amérique. Les pèlerins eux-mêmes s'adressèrent à des marchands londoniens pour obtenir le capital nécessaire à la réalisation de leur projet. Dans les colonies, se forma une élite d'entrepreneurs qui édifièrent leur fortune en exploitant les ressources du continent américain. Les armateurs de Boston, les négociants de New York et les grands planteurs du Sud constituaient une aristocratie de l'argent qui, en collaboration avec la métropole nourricière, avait la responsabilité de travailler au progrès de la colonisation britannique tout en assurant sa propre prospérité. Lorsque la bourgeoisie coloniale se jugea assez puissante pour se dispenser de la protection tutélaire de la mère-patrie, elle prit

l'initiative de rompre ses liens politiques avec Londres. Elle eut soin, cependant, de ne pas mettre fin aux relations culturelles et économiques profitables qu'elle avait toujours eues avec la Grande-Bretagne. Celle-ci continua encore, pendant quatre autres générations, à remplir son rôle de métropole nourricière.

* * *

La colonisation de la vallée du Saint-Laurent ne se réalisa pas différemment de celle des autres régions de l'Amérique. Mais le Canada eut deux métropoles. Aux XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles, la France fonda une société coloniale dont le développement normal fut arrêté par la Conquête de 1760. En s'emparant du territoire habité par les Canadiens, la Grande-Bretagne y commença une nouvelle colonisation qui a produit le Canada anglais contemporain.

De 1608 à 1760, la France tenta d'établir dans la vallée du Saint-Laurent une colonie permanente. Elle y consacra une partie importante de ses ressources en fournissant à la Nouvelle-France des immigrants et des capitaux. Le gouvernement français dépensa des sommes considérables pour protéger la colonie contre la menace iroquoise et anglaise. Il encouragea le commerce, l'agriculture et l'industrie en accordant des subventions aux producteurs coloniaux et en leur assurant des marchés. Il favorisa les expéditions des explorateurs et des marchands de fourrures. Il versa des allocations et des gratifications à l'Eglise, aux hôpitaux et aux institutions d'enseignement. Grâce à l'aide généreuse de leur métropole nourricière, les Canadiens réussirent à édifier une société assez riche et assez dynamique pour s'emparer des principales voies de communication qui conduisaient vers l'intérieur du continent. Solidement ancrés de Québec à Montréal, ils rayonnèrent depuis la Baie d'Hudson jusqu'à la Nouvelle-Orléans et depuis l'Acadie jusqu'aux Rocheuses. Ce vaste empire fut un témoignage de la puissance de la France de Louis XIV et de l'audace de ses colons d'Amérique.

Dès ses débuts, l'expansion coloniale française groupa une classe d'entrepreneurs métropolitains et coloniaux dont les intérêts étaient liés au progrès de la colonisation. Les premières compagnies qui s'occupèrent de la mise en valeur de la vallée du Saint-Laurent se composaient de marchands et d'armateurs. En 1645, la bourgeoisie canadienne organisa la Compagnie des Habitants qui se fit concéder le monopole de la Compagnie de la Nouvelle-France. Plusieurs autres compagnies canadiennes se formèrent au cours des XVII^e et XVIII^e siècles. Leurs actionnaires se recrutaient parmi les riches commerçants de fourrures. On les appelle l'aristocratie du castor. D'autres entrepreneurs français et canadiens s'enrichirent dans le commerce maritime, dans l'industrie du bois et dans les pêcheries. L'Etat subventionna des chantiers maritimes et les Forges du Saint-Maurice. La Nouvelle-France eut une bourgeoisie capitaliste pros-

père qui travailla à son propre enrichissement et au progrès de la colonie. Celle-ci n'était pas uniquement peuplée de paysans, de militaires et de missionnaires. Il est temps de renoncer à la légende d'une Nouvelle-France agricole et théocratique. La société canadienne, que la métropole et ses entrepreneurs capitalistes avaient édifiée en Amérique, possédait, avant la Conquête anglaise, tous les caractères d'une collectivité normale de l'époque dans le monde atlantique. Malheureusement, les Canadiens n'étaient pas assez nombreux. Ils succombèrent sous les coups de leurs ennemis. Le Canada devint une colonie britannique où survécut une population d'origine française.

Les Anglais n'avaient pas conquis la vallée du Saint-Laurent pour y continuer l'œuvre colonisatrice de la France. Même s'ils l'avaient voulu, ils en auraient été incapables. Privée de l'aide de sa métropole nourricière, la société canadienne ne pouvait plus se développer normalement. Abandonnée à ses seules ressources, elle était vouée à la stagnation — sinon à l'assimilation totale. Ses classes dirigeantes furent déchues de leur ancien rôle. Une autre métropole s'était substituée à la France. Des fonctionnaires anglais s'emparèrent de l'administration du pays. Une nouvelle équipe d'entrepreneurs capitalistes prit le contrôle de la vie économique du Canada. L'ancienne Nouvelle-France était devenue un territoire ouvert à la colonisation britannique. Celle-ci engendra un nouveau Canada.

Sous la protection bienveillante de la Grande-Bretagne, une nouvelle société coloniale se constitua dans la vallée du Saint-Laurent. Ses membres s'appelèrent d'abord les *British Americans*. Les immigrants et les capitaux venus de la mère-patrie contribuèrent à créer un Canada anglais dynamique qui, par l'union de toutes les colonies de l'Amérique du Nord britannique, s'étendit d'Halifax à Vancouver. La métropole dut consentir, jusqu'au XX^e siècle, de lourds sacrifices pour permettre à ses coloniaux de réaliser leur projet d'établir un royaume britannique au nord de la république américaine. Grâce au courage et à la vision des *British Americans*, grâce aussi à la compréhension des dirigeants politiques de l'empire, grâce surtout au surplus économique de l'Angleterre, l'entreprise a été couronnée de succès.

Les entrepreneurs du Canada anglais ont magnifiquement rempli leur rôle dans la colonisation et dans la mise en valeur de la vallée du Saint-Laurent. Des fondateurs de la *North West Company* aux administrateurs du *Canadian Pacific Railway*, de James McGill à Sir Herbert Holt, la bourgeoisie *British American* ou *Canadian* a orienté les destinées du Canada anglais. Forte de l'appui des capitaux britanniques influents dans les milieux politiques et sachant exploiter les relations du Canada avec le marché impérial, elle a veillé au développement du pays tout en bâtissant sa propre prospérité. Elle a été, après la métropole nourricière, le principal agent de la colonisation britannique au Canada. Trop sou-

vent, les historiens sous-évaluent son action déterminante sur l'évolution historique du pays.

* * *

Cet essai d'histoire coloniale veut rappeler quel a été le rôle des métropoles et des entrepreneurs dans la colonisation de l'Amérique. En même temps, il démontre qu'une société coloniale privée de sa métropole nourricière et de sa classe d'entrepreneurs ne pouvait pas se développer normalement. Les historiens qui étudient l'évolution du Canada français depuis la Conquête n'ont pas la liberté d'ignorer ce fait. S'ils n'en tiennent pas compte c'est parce qu'ils ont une vue incomplète du phénomène de la colonisation.

THE AGE OF THE GREGORIAN REFORM AND THE INVESTITURE CONTROVERSY: NEW INTERPRETATION

NORMAN F. CANTOR
Princeton University

The eight decades from the middle of the 11th century to the end of the third decade of the 12th constitute one of the great turning-points in European history. It was one of those periods during which vitally important changes in all aspects of life occurred simultaneously and with such great rapidity that no contemporary could foresee the far-reaching consequences of many of these changes. Nor can the historian with all the advantage of hindsight and even after the most painstaking labours disentangle all the causal relationships which inaugurated great upheavals in political, economic, religious and intellectual life. Hence from this point of view alone, these eight medieval decades resemble the critical eras of the modern world: the first half of the 16th century, the second half of the 18th, and the first half of the 20th century. In all these crucial periods in the history of the West, the forces of change, for better or worse, frustrated so long, burst forth over the land like a flood, leaving behind the wrecked structure of an old order and the foundation of a changed pattern of social life. At most times Western men appear to be like sleepwalkers, accepting passively the social framework built up over the centuries that have gone before. But during these critical periods of change they appear more like daydreamers, pursuing an only partly defined ideal which now inspires their intellect, and with the novelty of now moving forward with eyes open instead of closed but still with only partial consciousness of the direction of their movement.

Such a period of fundamental and at the same time rapid change was the age of the Gregorian reforms and the investiture controversy. It was the period of enormous commercial expansion, of the well-known rise of urban communities, of the first expression of political influence on the part of the new burgher class. It was an age in which the first really successful medieval monarchy was created in Anglo-Norman England on the basis of the feudal institutions and administrative methods and personnel created by the energetic and far-seeing Norman dukes. It was an age in which the long separation of the new Western European civilization from the life of the Mediterranean world came to an end. This isolation, in existence since the 8th century, is now replaced by the political and economic penetration of the West European peoples into the Mediterranean basin to the detriment of the Moslems and Byzantines who had so long ruled the Mediterranean lands and controlled Medi-

terranean trade without a challenge from the north. It was an age of tremendous intellectual vitality which witnessed the most important contributions to the Latin Christian theology since Augustine, and the slow transformation of some of the cathedral schools of Northern France into the universities of the following centuries. It was an age of great vitality in legal thought in which Roman law came to be carefully studied for the first time since the German invasion of the 5th century and great strides were made in the codification of canon law.

But as in the eras of fundamental change in modern history these achievements must be given second place in importance by the historian in favor of an ideological struggle. Out of a far-reaching controversy on the nature of the right order to be established in the world the pattern of the civilization of the following centuries was to emerge. As I have written elsewhere, the period from 1050 to 1130 was dominated by an attempt at world-revolution which influenced in highly effective ways the other aspects of social change. It seems, in retrospect, that it was almost necessary for a revolutionary onslaught to shake to its foundations the order of the early middle ages in order that the new political, economic, and intellectual forces be given the opportunity to develop in the face of the old institutions and ideas.

II¹

My own interpretation of the investiture controversy is very much indebted to the work of the brilliant German historian Gerd Tellenbach, but it gives even more universal significance to the intellectual conflicts of the period than Tellenbach's study, published in 1936.

It has been characteristic of the history of the West that its destiny has been shaped by four world-revolutions in which previous tendencies culminated and from which new ideas and systems emerged. By a world-revolution I mean a widespread and thoroughgoing revolution in world-view, the emergence of a new ideology which rejects the results of several centuries of development, organized into the prevailing system, and calls for a new right order in the world. In modern history these world-revolutions are well known — the Protestant revolution of the sixteenth century, the liberal revolution of the eighteenth century, the Communist revolution of the twentieth. The investiture controversy constitutes the first of the great world-revolutions of western history, and its course follows the same pattern as the well-known revolutions of modern times.

Each of the world-revolutions has begun with some just complaint about moral wrongs in the prevailing political, social, or religious system.

¹ Section II of this paper is adopted, with several emendations and additions, from my book *Church, Kingship, and Lay Investiture in England 1089-1135* (Princeton, 1958), pp. 6-9.

In the case of the investiture controversy the leaders of the revolution, who have been called the Gregorian reformers, complained about the domination of the church by laymen and the involvement of the church in feudal obligations which had been the foundations of social order in Western Europe at least since the 9th century. This system had led to severe abuses, especially that of simony, which came to be defined in its most general sense as the interference of laymen with the right ordering of church offices and sacraments. In their condemnation of simony as heresy, the Gregorians had a perfectly valid complaint.

It has been characteristic of all the world-revolutions, however, that while each has begun by complaining about abuses in the prevailing world order, the ultimate aim of the revolutionary ideologists has been not the reform of the prevailing system, but rather its abolition and replacement by a new order. In the case of the investiture controversy, complete freedom of the church from control by the state, the negation of the sacramental character of kingship, and the domination of the papacy over secular rulers, constituted the ideal new order. It is not surprising to find that most of the important leaders of the reform movement came from precisely those parts of Western Europe where political authority was weakest and most decentralized — from Northern Italy and Lorraine. No churchman could develop enthusiasm for kingship in these regions.

As in the case of all other world-revolutions, the ideology of the Gregorians called forth violent opposition on the part of both vested interests and sincere theoretical defenders of the old order. After many acrimonious disputes and a flood of propaganda literature, bitter and protracted warfare resulted. The polarization of educated society into revolutionary and conservative left a large group of uncommitted moderates, including some of the best minds of the age, who could see right and wrong on both sides. Among these moderates was the greatest French churchman and canon lawyer of his day, Bishop Ivo of Chartres. The eminent and wise theologian and canonist Archbishop Lanfranc of Canterbury began as an uncommitted moderate but became more and more openly critical of the Gregorian reform movement in the last years of his life.

As in the case of all other world-revolutions, the ideologists of the investiture controversy were only partially successful in creating the new order. They succeeded in destroying the old system, but the new world was not the revolutionary utopia. Rather it was a reconstruction of the political and religious system which took into account both old and new elements and left room for the human limitations of greed and power. The church gained a large measure of freedom from secular control, and there was a noticeable improvement in the moral and intellectual level of the clergy. But the church itself, from the time of the investiture controversy, became more and more interested in secular affairs, and

the papacy of the high Middle Ages competed successfully for wealth and power with kings and emperors. The church itself became a great super-state governed by the papal administration.

As in the case of all other world-revolutions, the ideologists during the investiture controversy were themselves united only upon the most immediate and more limited aims of the revolution. As the revolution proceeded, the Gregorians divided into a moderate and a radical wing, each led by eminent cardinals. The radicals were headed by Humbert and Hildebrand, the later Gregory VII; the moderates by Peter Damiani. Cardinal Damiani was a former eremitic monk and a mystic from Northern Italy, a precursor of St. Bernard and St. Francis. Humbert was an extremely learned and highly fanatical monastic scholar from Lorraine. Gregory VII was a native Roman, conscious of all the hierocratic traditions of the early medieval papacy.

As in the modern world-revolutions, the radicals lost their leadership not to the moderates of their own group, whom they had earlier swept aside, but rather to the politicians, the practical statesmen, who called a halt to revolution and tried to reconstruct from the battered pieces of the old system and the achievements of the revolution a new and workable synthesis which would again make progress possible. This tendency is already evident during the pontificate of Urban II in the last decade of the eleventh century, and it became dominant in the papacy during the 1120's.

Like all world-revolutions, the investiture controversy never reached a final and complete solution. New ideas in a new generation made former issues less meaningful and the men of the new generation turned to other interests and new problems. Just as Voltaire and Hume could not understand why the men of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries should have fought over abstruse theological principles, likewise, in the 1130's, a canon of York Cathedral could not understand why Archbishop Anselm and King Henry I should have quarrelled over lay investiture two decades before.

The age of the investiture controversy may rightly be regarded as the turning-point in medieval civilization. It was the fulfilment of the early Middle Ages because in it the acceptance of the Christian religion by the Germanic peoples reached its final and decisive stage. On the other hand, the greater part of the religious and political system of the high Middle Ages emerged out of the events and ideas of the investiture controversy.

III

It is the course of the investiture controversy in Germany from 1075 to 1122 which has received the most careful study by modern scholars and which therefore naturally dominates the textbook accounts of the

period. There are good reasons for emphasizing the German investiture controversy. Not only did the dispute on the issue of royal authority over the church go on for a half century in the German Empire and produce a mass of polemical literature of greatest importance for medieval political thought, but also, as German historians have again and again pointed out during the past fifty or sixty years, the investiture controversy was the great turning-point in medieval German history. Just when the slow and patient work at building up the power of the central authority in Germany against the dukes and other elements of localism and disintegration seemed to be completed in the 1070's, the papal deposition of the emperor and the papal summons to the German nobility to revolt undid most of the achievements of the energetic and shrewd Ottonian and Salian kings. It is true that some historians have claimed that the Germany monarchy in any case lacked the administrative institutions to perpetuate a powerful centralized government and that the work of the Ottonian and Salian dynasties was more a stupendous balancing act of the forces of localism, doomed to eventual disaster, than the creation of central monarchy on secure foundation. But the fact remains, whatever our judgments on the institution of the German Empire, that it was precisely the investiture controversy which unleashed the forces of localism and allowed them to become firmly entrenched in German life between 1075 and 1122. As a result, not all the ingenuity, popular appeal, hard work, and high ideals of the Hohenstaufen rulers of the 12th and 13th centuries could avail to rebuild the authority of the central power, thereby dooming Germany to the maze of petty principalities which controlled and ruined its political life for six centuries.

With all the attention devoted to the German development, the relatively short-lived investiture controversy in Anglo-Norman England has received very little study. Indeed it has frequently been dismissed as of no significance and even in our standard books on English history receives only a line or two. It has always been said that even the supposedly most important result of the English controversy, the Concordat of London of 1107, which provided the compromise for ending the investiture dispute and established the model for the very similar Concordat of Worms of 1122, has very little to do with the Anglo-Norman kingdom. The compromise principle was supposedly invented by Bishop Ivo of Chartres, the greatest canon lawyer of his day.

My own detailed study of the English investiture controversy has shown that these traditional views are vulnerable on many grounds, not the least of which is the falsity of the Ivo of Chartres thesis, and has revealed that many aspects of the English investiture controversy are of great significance for the pattern of development of the age of the Gregorian reforms. Indeed, in some ways, the English situation better helps us to understand the long-range significance of the investiture controversy than the German developments.

Not until the election of Anselm, the venerated theologian and abbot of Bec, as Archbishop of Canterbury in 1093 was any attempt made to alter fundamentally the Anglo-Norman church-state system created by William I and Lanfranc. After Lanfranc's death in 1089, William Rufus had continued and strengthened this system, whose essence was the domination of the royal authority over all aspects of ecclesiastical life by means of bringing the church within the feudal order. But Anselm was sympathetic to the Gregorian reform doctrines and he inevitably came into conflict with the King and his episcopal colleagues. After Anselm and his opponents had made clear their fundamental disagreements at the Rockingham assembly of 1095, the Archbishop appealed to Pope Urban II for support. But the Pope, who was conducting papal policy along other lines than Gregorian principles, refused to aid Anselm, even when the Archbishop went to Rome during his exile from England between 1097 and 1100.

After the accession of Henry I in 1100, and Anselm's return from the Continent, the King and Archbishop worked together harmoniously to reform the English Church, in a limited way, and to secure the throne for Henry. Although Anselm was at first reluctant to disturb this harmony by pressing the issue on lay investiture, as the radical Gregorian Pope Paschal II was demanding, by 1103 the investiture issue had come to the fore and the English investiture controversy was marked by the publication of polemical literature on both sides. The "Anonymous" tracts, of which several or all were written by Gerard of York, were the most important contribution from the royal side. Harkening back to Anglo-Saxon tradition, several of the "Anonymous" tracts affirm the theocratic nature of kingship and thereby attempt to validate royal investiture of ecclesiastics.

The English investiture controversy was brought to an end by the agreement of 1107, which embodied a compromise originating in royal circles. Bishop Ivo of Chartres had nothing to do with this compromise. His views on lay investiture differ profoundly from the principles of the Concordat of London of 1107. The most probable authors of the compromise, which allowed the king to retain homage of ecclesiastics while it prohibited lay investiture, were the chief royal counselor, the Norman Count Robert of Meulan and the King himself. Robert was anxious to be released from papal excommunication, while Henry wanted the Pope's acquiescence in his conquest of Normandy. Paschal II finally accepted the compromise because of vehement opposition to radical Gregorian doctrines in England, and also because he wished to obtain the King's support for Bohemond's crusade against Byzantium. By 1105, all the English higher clergy wanted to end the investiture controversy. Anselm, who had again been in exile since 1104, returned to England in 1107, and a complete reconciliation between King and Archbishop was achieved by the time of Anselm's death two years later.

Between 1109 and the end of his reign, Henry I completely restored royal control over the composition and life of the English Church. Reform ideals still lingered on, especially in canon law collections, and the famous case of Archbishop Thurstan of York demonstrated the possibility of papal intervention in the English Church arising out of the relation between Rome and the English higher clergy established during the investiture controversy. But Henry's authority was not effectively challenged by the papacy, especially when reforming ideals declined in the papal *curia* in the last decade of his reign.

IV

If now, in conclusion, we recollect that in Anglo-Norman England by the end of the 12th century there was to appear for the first time a centralized political organization which resembled the modern state in its emphasis on administrative bureaucracy, and in its success in subordinating other political forms to the royal exchequer and law-courts, we can understand the long-range significance of the English investiture controversy. In the case of Germany, the Gregorian revolutionaries were attacking what was still the early medieval kind of kingship which had been in existence in its full form since the reign of Charlemagne — a monarchy based primarily on the personal strength and prestige of the king, buttressed by the ideology of theocratic kingship. Only in Anglo-Norman England does there appear the new political order to which eventually belonged the future destiny of Western Europe — the bureaucratic state. It is true that William the Conqueror and his two sons took over the Anglo-Saxon theocratic kingship as an additional basis of royal authority. But their authority was built up predominantly on the kind of feudalism the Anglo-Norman kings created in England. Feudal institutions were used as foundations for the building up of administrative bureaucracy. The resulting political system would be close to absolutism by the beginning of the 13th century. Hence Henry I could afford to give up lay investiture with its implication of theocratic kingship. He gave it up with a great deal of reluctance which indicates the extent to which ideas of quasi-sacred kingship, so popular in the West since the 8th century, still dominated the mind of even the shrewdest western ruler. But in the end he did give it up and did so with impunity, working in the last two decades of his reign to strengthen those secular bases of monarchy which his grandson, Henry II, was to use with such overpowering effectiveness.

It is therefore no surprise to find that when Archbishop Thomas Becket attempted to resurrect the Gregorian ideology in the 1160's, he was greeted on all sides with hostility and suspicion and his views already sounded archaic not only to his countrymen but to the Pope himself. How often are the revolutionaries in the end primarily

responsible for the creation of an order whose principles are precisely the opposite of their original aims ! The Gregorians attacked theocratic kingship, an institution which, if responsible for many abuses, was also productive of many kings of great piety who were the friends and patrons of the church. Medieval kingship, now divested of its religious sanctions, had to find its authority in non-religious fields. Hence the ultimate effect of the Gregorian revolution was to encourage the creation of the secular state, the Great Leviathan, which already makes its appearance in 12th century England and which is, by the beginning of the 14th century, the victorious enemy of the church and the papacy.

THE IDEA OF ART AS PROPAGANDA DURING THE FRENCH REVOLUTION

JAMES A. LEITH
University of Saskatchewan

"In a republic a thing is good only because it is useful."
Espercieux, President of *La Société républicaine des arts*¹.

The French Revolution challenged the social prestige which artists had won at the beginning of the modern era. Beginning with the Italian Renaissance artists had lifted themselves from the level of mere artisans into the ranks of the liberal arts by minimizing the manual labour involved in their work and by emphasizing the imaginative elements. Thereafter, throughout early modern times, artists envisaged themselves as geniuses whose masterpieces represented the finest expression of creative imagination. Artists may not always have been well paid, but they did have cultural prestige. They liked to think of themselves as members of a creative élite equal to, if not better than, the poets. The French Revolution, however, brought to a climax certain currents of thought which not only questioned the value of the artist's work but suggested that it was detrimental to the welfare of society.

Echoing the theme of Rousseau's first *Discours*, many thinkers contended that luxury sapped the moral strength of a nation. According to their judgment, societies were born stoic and died epicurean. Such a view tended to be antagonistic to the fine arts because they seemed to flourish in the rich but decadent phases of social development. Naturally this antipathy toward luxury reached its peak during the emergency republic when Spartan austerity was the order of the day. Speaking on education, Durand de Maillane told the Convention that all the higher arts were dangerous because "luxury was incompatible with a republic".² Nor was this argument overcome easily. As late as 1796 Bugny was arguing in the *Magazin encyclopédique* that the fine arts always shone in a period when societies had become corrupt, and that they were always accompanied by moral decay.³

Artists also had to defend themselves against the accusation that they had undermined morality by portraying degenerate themes. Since

¹ A. Détournelle, *Aux armes et aux arts. Peinture, sculpture, architecture, gravure. Journal de la Société républicaine des arts séant au Louvre*, Paris, n.d., p. 330.

² P. T. Durand de Maillane, *Opinion sur les écoles primaires prononcée à la Convention nationale le 12 décembre 1792*, Paris, n.d., p. 3.

³ L. P. de Bugny, «De l'influence des belles-lettres, des sciences, et des arts sur la situation politique des nations», *Magazin encyclopédique*, 1796, Vol. X, pp. 14-29.

the middle of the century a series of critics had rebuked artists for painting seductive portraits, adulterous boudoir scenes, and erotic activities among the classical gods.⁴ As the Revolution entered its radical phase, republicans added to such criticisms, charging that artists had pandered to the *ancien régime* by glamorizing gross superstitions, flattering powdered aristocrats, and by deifying despots.⁵ This argument also was not easily defeated. During 1797 Mercier, an eminent personality in the world of letters, was repeating these bitter accusations in the *Journal de Paris*: "Idolatries of every kind, the propagation of servile ideas, childish putrefaction, the distortion of the great panorama of nature, the ruination of innocence and perhaps of public decency such is the influence of the visual arts."⁶

Finally, even if they could repudiate the charge that their work was noxious, artists had to meet the indictment that they contributed nothing to human progress. Compared with the contributions of natural science and the mechanical arts *les beaux arts* seemed to have done very little for the masses of the people.⁷ To be reproached for doing nothing to better society was a serious matter in an age which had come to equate utility with goodness. And it became all the more serious when the new republic was threatened by enemies within and without.⁸ In such emergency conditions it seemed to some zealous republicans that it was a crime to create something which was merely charming. Everything useless was to be proscribed in a republic. A thing was harmful even as it served no purpose.

Thus artists, who had considered themselves members of a cultural aristocracy, found their work associated with enervating luxury, denounced as a baleful influence, or depreciated as a superfluous activity. However, at the same time as these criticisms had mounted an answer to them had developed. Beginning around the middle of the century

⁴ J. J. Rousseau, *Discours sur les sciences et les arts*, 1750, ed. G. R. Havens, N.Y., 1946, p. 138ff and 148 ff; D. Diderot, «*Encyclopédie*», *Œuvres complètes*, ed. Assézat, XIV, p. 488; La Font de Saint-Yenne, *Réflexions sur quelques causes de l'état présent de la peinture en France*, La Haye, 1747, p. 70ff; Saint-Yves, *Observations sur les arts*, Paris, 1748, *passim*.

⁵ A. C. Thibaudeau made such accusations in the Convention, *Moniteur* N. 232, May 11, 1794, p. 943; F. A. de Boissy d'Anglas, *Quelques idées sur les arts, sur la nécessité de les encourager, et sur divers établissements nécessaires à l'enseignement public*, Paris, l'an II, p. 128, mentions widespread antagonism to the arts and a tendency to question their value in a republic.

⁶ L. S. Mercier, «*Aux auteurs du Journal*», *Journal de Paris*, 10 Fructidor, l'an V (August 27, 1797), pp. 1399-1400. This was one of a long series of attacks on the fine arts.

⁷ Defenders of the fine arts tried to show that they could be as useful as the mechanical arts: "Preuves de l'utilité des beaux arts", *Décade philosophique*, June 28, 1794, Vol. L, pp. 401-410.

⁸ In the introduction to the catalogue for the Salon of 1793 artists made a long apology for engaging in artistic work in the midst of emergency conditions: *Descriptions des ouvrages de peinture exposés au Sallon (sic) du Louvre par les artistes composant la Commune générale des arts le 10 Août 1793*.

a number of *encyclopédistes*, art critics and journalists had defended art by arguing that it could be used to disseminate moral ideals, to immortalize patriotic deeds, and to dramatize national achievements.⁹ When the radical phase of the Revolution brought the crisis in the attitude toward art to a climax this idea of using art as a means of public instruction, as a method of propagating dogmas, was used to defend the visual arts against those who, like Plato, would have driven the arts from the good society. Jacques Lebrun explained this conception whereby the arts could demonstrate their utility by serving as propaganda:

How culpable are those profanatory artists who prostitute their talents by offering counterrevolutionary pictures, who forget that their essential characteristic is to be philosophic; that their primary duty is to choose subjects which tend to instruct, to reform morals, to inspire love of country and enthusiasm for liberty.¹⁰

Artists who argued that the primary rôle of art was to instruct were not moved by idealism alone. The Revolution had destroyed the patronage of those groups — the court, the aristocracy, and the church — which to a large extent had sustained the arts in the past. Under this economic duress, artists wished to demonstrate their usefulness to the republican government to which they now had to turn for assistance.¹¹ However, the idea of art as propaganda not only provided an appeal to the government, but also supplied a conception of the fine arts which enabled artists to answer the criticisms hurled against them, and to regain their social esteem. Society now gave its approval to those intellectuals who contributed to the progress of mankind by spreading enlightened ideas. In order to belong to the cultural élite it was no longer sufficient for artists to claim that they were akin to poets: they had to prove that they could be educators as well. By giving a moral and political direction to their work artists could enter the sacred company of the *philosophes*.¹²

The idea that art could be effective as propaganda rested on certain common assumptions which eighteenth century thinkers made about the human mind. One of these assumptions was that ideas were composed of sensations which the individual received from the outer world. It

⁹ Diderot had argued in his *Salons* that art should transmit moral truths; L. S. Mercier had prophesied that art would have an educative role in the future utopia: *L'An 2440*, Amsterdam, 1770 definitive edition, Paris, 1786, Vol. II, 59-84; See *l'Année littéraire*, 1779, Vol. VII, 37, 56; 1781, VII, 243; also Lacombe, ..., *Le Spectacle des beaux arts*, Paris, 1758, p. 56; La Font de Saint-Yenne, *Sentiments sur quelques ouvrages du Salon de 1753*, Paris, 1754, p. 51 ff.

¹⁰ Détournelle, *Aux armes et aux arts*, p. 192.

¹¹ M. Dreyfous, *Les arts et les artistes pendant la période révolutionnaire*, Paris, 1906, p. 155 ff.

¹² J. L. David argued that the artist would have to become a *philosophe*: *Rapport sur la nomination des cinquante membres du jury qui doit juger le concours des prix de peinture, sculpture et architecture*, November 15, 1793, p. 3.

followed that the ideas which an individual possessed depended on impressions which were made on his mind, especially when he was very young. This belief in the impressionability of the mind was very often combined with the notion that nature had used beauty in order to make those objects attractive which were beneficial to man. By conveying civic lessons in an appealing guise, art could utilize the same technique to guide mankind toward socially desirable ends.¹³ After exposure to a didactic work of art the individual would associate the message with the pleasant emotions aroused by the art. The eighteenth century may not have had modern motivational research, but it did possess a primitive associational psychology which suggested that the visual arts could be used as an invaluable instrument for disseminating ideas.

The supposition that nature had endowed mankind with a propensity toward good also encouraged confidence in the efficacy of art as a means of influencing public opinion. According to this view nature had placed within the human heart the germs of all the virtues needed for happiness among men. This implied that mankind was misguided rather than sinful with the consequence that human progress did not depend so much on changing the human heart as on stimulating the basic impulses implanted there by nature.¹⁴ Hence art which bore a moral message would be appealing to the natural instincts of man. Such a view meant that art could fulfill a rôle of which the church never could have conceived. Art, properly directed, could actually contribute to the regeneration of the human heart. In an essay on the arts which he dedicated to the Convention Boissy d'Anglas laid bare these basis assumptions:

It is therefore by educating man that you will renew him, so to speak, fundamentally and absolutely; it is by purifying his reason and his morals, it is by making him aware of the power and the danger of his emotions, by teaching him to direct them toward the good, that you will lead him back to the original simplicity with which nature endowed him, and which he has not lost except through ignorance or the evils of misguided opinions.¹⁵

Granted such presuppositions art could actually *faire naître des vertus*. In this respect we must remember that the revolutionaries wanted to use art, not only to stir up political sentiments, but also to assist in the moral transformation which they felt was essential to the success of the republic. Art, therefore, was not only to portray political themes, was not only to arouse an awareness of the achievements of the Revolution,

¹³ P. J. B. Chaussard, *Essai philosophique sur la dignité des arts*, Paris, l'an VI, p. 7 ff. Fulltest examination of the effect of art on the mind was in G.M. Raymond, *De la peinture considérée dans ses effets sur les hommes en général et de son influence sur les mœurs et le gouvernement des peuples*, Paris, 1799, p. 186 ff.

¹⁴ Anonymous, «Lettre ... sur la perfectibilité de l'esprit humain», *La Décade philosophique*, Vol. XXI, l'an VII, pp. 149-159.

¹⁵ F. A. Boissy d'Anglas, *Essai sur les fêtes nationales, suivi de quelques idées sur les arts et sur la nécessité de les encourager adressé à la Convention nationale*, Paris, l'an II, p. 7.

but was also to idealize the simple domestic virtues which were considered vital to the "Republic of Virtue". In a report to the Convention Robespierre recommended not only the glorification of liberty, patriotism, and stoicism, but also the exaltation of frugality, conjugal faithfulness, paternal love, motherly affection, filial devotion, hard work, and agricultural labour.¹⁶ Advocates of art as an educative force contended that by idealizing these humbler duties,¹⁷ as well as by portraying more heroic virtues, art would cease to be simply a pleasant diversion, the pastime of the privileged classes, and would become an instrument for the alteration of society.¹⁸

This idea that art could be used to teach and improve, to spur on to action and set an example, found its fullest expression in the proceedings of the *Société populaire et républicaine des arts* organized by pro-revolutionary artists during the most radical phase of the Revolution.¹⁹ These artists proclaimed that art had no value, no rôle to play in society, unless it contributed to the triumph of republican ideals. As advocates of utilitarian art they hoped to promote a cult of patriotism by idealizing the exploits of republican heroes.²⁰ Images of republican heroism were to be multiplied everywhere in order to arouse in others devotion to the republic. Most of the members of this society favoured an austere classical style of art, not only because it seemed to offer a suitable form in which to portray the virile deeds of the Revolution, but also because it recalled similar patriotism in the days of the Roman Republic. Bienaimé, reading a petition on behalf of the Society, appealed to the Convention to commission works of art which would stir up the people. The Society wanted heroic and virtuous actions portrayed everywhere, in all the departments, in all the sections, in all the popular assemblies, in all the public squares, in all the primary schools "that everywhere the people might find moral lessons."²¹

The government supported this idea that art should be used to impress republican ideals on the masses. The Committee of Public Safety was anxious to mobilize all the forces which could influence public opinion. During the spring of 1794 the Committee approved plans for a grandiose national park surrounding the *Palais national*. The scheme included plans for a gymnasium, triumphal arches, symbolic figures, and statues of republican heroes. All these various structures were to be decorated with low reliefs or paintings "capable of arousing republican ideals

¹⁶ *Décret de la Convention*, 18 Floréal, l'an II.

¹⁷ J. B. P. LeBrun, *Essai sur les moyens d'encourager la peinture, la sculpture, l'architecture et la gravure*, Paris, l'an II, p. 8 ff.

¹⁸ L. F. R. Portiez, *Sur l'instruction publique*, Convention nationale, 1793 *passim*.

¹⁹ Détournelle, *Aux armes et aux arts, passim*, H. Lapauze (ed.), *Procès-verbaux de la Société populaire et républicaine des arts*, Paris, 1903.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 8 ff.

²¹ *Ibid.*, p. 15.

in youth.”²² The Committee of Public Safety also approved contests for other monuments destined for various parts of the capital dramatizing the victories of the Revolution, depicting the overthrow of the monarchy, or showing the French people trampling down Federalism. In addition the Committee called on all artists of the republic to represent themes of their choice drawn from the glorious Revolution.²³ One of the government announcements in the *Journal de Paris* explained the rôle the arts were to play:

Under the republican regime the arts will regain their dignity, they will atone for their former servility; of old they corrupted the public mind now they are going to regenerate it; and liberty will receive from them more assistance than they ever gave to despotism.²⁴

Throughout the spring of 1794, at the height of political crisis the Committee of Public Safety pressed ahead with its artistic plans with the same note of urgency which it devoted to military matters. Those in charge of supervising the project of the *Jardin national* were ordered to remove all obstacles which hindered progress and were told to report to the Committee on all the ways in which the work could be accelerated. At the same time the Commission of Public Works was ordered to furnish all the men, materials, and funds necessary for the rapid execution of the plan.²⁵ Clearly the Committee of Public Safety considered that the creation of republican symbols was a pressing necessity. Then, without any explanation, at the end of a series of urgent directives there came an abrupt order calling a halt to the work. The date, 16 Thermidor, is explanation enough.²⁶ The guillotine had intervened. David, who had inspired most of the *politique artistique* of the revolutionary government, barely escaped the same fate as Robespierre.

Meanwhile the Committee had opened a contest for monuments, statues and paintings glorifying the Revolution. The contest closed a few days before 9 Thermidor. More than four hundred plans, models, and sketches had been submitted and something had to be done with them. More than a year later an art jury²⁷ decided to award one hundred and eight prizes worth more than four hundred thousand *livres*. Gérard won first prize worth twenty thousand *livres* with a plan for a huge painting entitled the *Tenth of August*. Vincent won second prize with a sketch for a painting honouring a *Republican Heroine of the Vendée*.²⁸

²² Archives Nationales : AF. II. 80, dossier 590.

²³ *Ibid.* Arrêté dated 5 Floréal, l'an II.

²⁴ *Journal de Paris*, 3 Prairial, l'an II, (May 22, 1794), No. 507, p. 2048.

²⁵ Archives Nationales : AF. II. 80, dossier 590 : Arrêtés dated 25 Floréal, 25 Prairial and 4 Messidor, l'an II.

²⁶ *Ibid.* AF. II. 80, dossier 591.

²⁷ *Loi portant qu'il sera nommé un jury ...* 9 Frimaire, l'an III, Archives Nationales AD. VIII. 12.

²⁸ *Extrait du procès-verbal des séances du jury des arts ...* Archives Nationales F 17 1057, dossier 3.

Like most of the other prize-winning plans these works were never executed. The most ambitious scheme to revolutionize the arts had failed.

The Committee of Public Safety was unable to carry out its ambitious plans to put the arts to work but the theory of art as propaganda did not die. Under the Directory artists, art critics, and government officials continued to expound the idea that in a republic the arts must play a political rôle, although the emphasis was now on the consolidation of the republic rather than on its regeneration. The Ministers of the Interior repeatedly reminded artists that they must give *grandes leçons* to the people.²⁹ At the same time the presidents of the *Institut national*, which had replaced the old academies, warned the young artists who won the grand prizes in painting, sculpture and architecture that the republic expected them to teach patriotism, to make virtue attractive and vice odious.³⁰ The idea of art as propaganda obviously was considered important when the fine arts section of the *Institut national* announced an essay contest in 1796 on the subject of the possible influence of art on the morals and government of a free people. All the essays submitted to this contest argued that art should glorify the nation, arouse republicanism, and teach domestic virtues.³¹

Scarcely anyone during the whole period discussed the role of art in society without contending that its true purpose was to be didactic. It is, therefore, very surprising at first to find that only a small fraction of the many works produced during the Revolution might be said to have served as propaganda. There were of course a number of works with an ideological content: Chevreux drew the *Triumph of the Revolution*; David produced such well-known works as *The Tennis Court Oath*, *The Death of Marat* — which might be called the *pietà* of the French Revolution — and the *Death of Lepelletier*; Regnault painted *Liberty or Death* and the *Genius of Liberty*; Reattu portrayed *The Triumph of Liberty*; Hennequin symbolized *The Triumph of the French People on August 10*; Thévenin had rendered *Augereau on the Bridge at Arcole*; Girodet depicted *A Representative of the Colonies*; but these, and others like them, were meagre fruits of an idea which was reiterated almost endlessly. Consequently, we must try to explain why so few

²⁹ P. Bénézech, *Appel aux Artistes*, Paris, l'an V; F. de Neufchâteau, *Le Ministre de l'Intérieur aux citoyens composant le jury des arts séant au muséum*, 30 Pluviose, l'an VII, Archives Nationales F. 17 1059, dossier 28.

³⁰ A. G. Camus, *Discours prononcé par le président de l'Institut national aux élèves qui ont remporté les grands prix ...* 15 Vendémiaire, l'an VI, Bibliothèque Nationale, Collection Deloynes, Vol. L, No. 1373; A. L. de Jussieu, *Discours prononcé ...* 15 Vendémiaire, l'an VII, Deloynes, Vol. L, No. 1377.

³¹ *Rapport au nom de la Commission nommée pour examiner les discours envoyés sur cette question proposée par la section de peinture, «Quelle a été et quelle peut être encore l'influence de la peinture sur les mœurs et le gouvernement du peuple libre»*, 15 Germinal, l'an VI, in Archives of the Académie française.

examples of art as propaganda were produced in a period when so many thinkers denied in theory that art had any other value.

Some of the reasons for such lack of results are obvious. Financial problems throughout the period made it difficult for the revolutionary governments to commission works of art on a grand scale. Government instability made it impossible to turn monumental plans into real accomplishments. Also, it was simple to talk about creating works of art conveying a revolutionary message but this was more difficult in practice. To complete a large historical painting might require several years, but meanwhile the theme might have become unacceptable because the Revolution had moved on. Christian artists had had a somewhat easier time because their saints were more permanent than those of the Revolution. However, the full reason for failure to produce political themes must be sought deeper in certain unresolved tensions implicit in the attitude toward art during the Revolution.

Perhaps the most important of these tensions was that between the affirmation of artistic freedom and the concept of utilitarian art. For artists the Revolution represented an important stage in the movement toward complete artistic freedom which had been developing ever since artists had separated themselves from the guilds. During the Revolution a group of discontented artists led a successful attack on the *Académie royale de peinture et sculpture* established by Mazarin. The Academy had been organized on an hierarchical basis with control concentrated in the hands of a privileged group. The assault on the Academy was in part, therefore, aimed at overthrowing what many considered simply another aristocratic institution inherited from the old régime.³² The revolt, however, had also involved a protest against the teaching methods of the Academy on the grounds that they cramped the free development of artistic talent. In attacking the Academy artists had asserted the right of each artist to develop his individual talent free from any institutional restraints. Speaking in the final debate on the issue in August 1793, David told the Convention that talent had not been free to develop under the Academy: "It is the policy of kings to maintain a balance of crowns, it is the policy of academies to maintain a balance of talents. Woe unto the reckless artist who tries to surpass the circle of Pompilius, he will become an outcast in the eyes of the Academicians."³³

Because the modern mind associates the idea of art as propaganda with definite controls over creative work we are surprised to find artists claiming complete artistic freedom precisely at the same moment in which they elaborated the theory of art as a revolutionary weapon. The

³² J. B. Restout, *Discours prononcé dans l'Académie royale de peinture et sculpture le 19 décembre 1789*, Paris, 1790.

³³ J. L. David, *Discours sur la nécessité de supprimer les Académies*. Séance du 8 Août 1793, Paris, n.d., p. 3.

fact is, however, that most of the proponents of the concept of art as propaganda believed that art could be given a social purpose without restricting artistic freedom. Many simply assumed that once art no longer had to grovel before the old patrons it would naturally turn to the inspiring themes provided by the Revolution. Discussing the fine arts in a free society the *Décade philosophique*, for example, was confident that now that genius was liberated it would be inflamed with a passion to portray the stirring efforts of the nation and the sublime virtues of everyday life. The assumption was that a free art would be eager to serve the republican cause.³⁴

Others thought that government patronage could direct the arts toward political service. They reasoned that in a republic public luxury should nourish the arts as private wealth had sustained them previously. The government would thus be able to use works of art to convey political messages to the masses of the people. However, the advocates of the scheme of large-scale government commissions do not seem to have felt that their scheme would enslave the artist in the way they claimed private patronage had done. The *Société républicaine des arts* apparently saw no threat to artistic freedom so long as government commissions were awarded by a jury of enlightened citizens. In this way the arts could be directed *à l'utilité et à la morale publique* while leaving the artist free to choose his own style.³⁵

Of course such a plan of government patronage did mean that the government would choose the themes to be portrayed. Certainly the Committee of Public Safety intended to commission works of art only if they would serve as republican propaganda. Even under the Directory the government made it clear that it would not give any commissions to artists unless it could control the themes which they treated. In 1799 Neufchâteau, the Minister of the Interior, made this abundantly clear in a letter to a special art jury judging works which had been exhibited in the various *Salons* since 1794.³⁶ He argued that the Revolution had done a great deal for artists whereas they had done very little for the Revolution. Because artists did not seem to recognize their duty to portray useful themes the government would have to guide them. Certainly the government was not going to give commissions as prizes without imposing conditions on the artists. The arts had borne the yoke of an inept theocracy and an insolent despotism without complaint; consequently they could scarcely complain about being guided by an

³⁴ « L'influence de la Liberté », *Décade philosophique*, 10 Floréal, l'an II, Vol. I, No. 1, pp. 7-11.

³⁵ E. Eynard, *Considérations sur l'état actuel des arts, sur les concours ... et sur le mode de jugement. Publiées par la Société républicaine des arts et présentées à la Convention* (1795). Earlier J. B. P. LeBrun, *Essai sur les moyens d'encourager la peinture, la sculpture, l'architecture et la gravure*, Paris, l'an III.

³⁶ Archives Nationales F 17 1059, dossier 28, letter dated 30 Pluviose, l'an VII (Feb. 18, 1799).

enlightened government. At any rate, Neufchâteau did not think that dictating the subject to an artist who won a government commission as a prize constituted an infringement on artistic freedom: "The arts were slaves under monarchies; in republics they are instruments or means. By this measure one does not damage their freedom. Artists can refuse to compete and devote themselves to other subjects."³⁷

As a result of this contest Girodet was required to paint *The Assassination of the French Ministers near Rastadt* and Bervick was ordered to engrave the same subject.³⁸ But because the government had very little money to spend on works of art this method of directing art toward propaganda was never a serious threat to artistic freedom. The result was that the Revolution left the artist almost completely dependent on the open market where, like any other producer, he had to try to please the customer. The catalogues to the *Salons* of the revolutionary period demonstrate that the customers wanted *genre* paintings, landscapes, and above all portraits.³⁹ Perhaps art lovers wished to escape politics for a time but, whatever the reason, there does not seem to have been a seller's market for republican paintings. Most of the advocates of art as an ideological weapon never suggested any control over artists to force them to treat political subjects. The Revolution never really faced, indeed never recognized, the tension between artistic freedom and art as propaganda.

Another unresolved tension was that between art as an aesthetic object and art as a useful instrument. Chaussard, who was one of the leading advocates of art as a propaganda medium, complained that in modern times men had made a serious error in relegating the arts to the sphere of mere aesthetic pleasure. Such thinkers, he argued, confounded the *means* which art used (which consisted of pleasing) with the *object* (which consisted in being socially useful).⁴⁰ Apparently, from this point of view, what was labelled the means, the aesthetic qualities of art, had no value by themselves without some didactic content. The revolutionaries, however, found it difficult to be consistently utilitarian in their approach, revealing by their actions or their comments that for them art still had value simply as art. The idea of art as a weapon of propaganda was apparently unable, even in the case of doctrinaire republicans, to overcome the tradition of art for the sake of art.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 3.

³⁸ *Rapport présenté au Ministre de l'Intérieur sur les travaux d'encouragement*, 20 Messidor, l'an VII (July 8, 1799), Arch. Nat. F 17 1056, dossier 13.

³⁹ Contemporaries were aware that artists had to paint such canvasses for the market: « Suite de l'Exposition au Salon », *Journal de Paris*, l'an VII, 23 Fructidor, No. 361, p. 1581.

⁴⁰ P. J. B. Chaussard, *Essai philosophique sur la dignité des arts*, Paris, l'an VI, p. 2.

One intriguing example of this survival of aesthetics can be seen in the ambivalent attitude of the revolutionaries toward the art of the old régime. From a republican point of view much of this art was not only useless but a political menace because it exalted tyrants, idealized aristocrats, and transmitted superstitions. Since they believed art could make a lasting impression on the public mind, the logical course of action was to remove all these pernicious images, to purge the republic of all anti-republican symbols. Actually the Revolution did destroy innumerable works of art — statues of kings, portraits of aristocrats, tapestries with feudalistic designs, even a considerable number of religious images — not simply because of uncontrolled vandalism, but as a result of conscious iconoclasm aimed at getting rid of art with a dangerous ideological content. Iconoclastic fervor reached a climax when, following the insurrection of the Paris Commune on August 10, 1792, the Legislative Assembly ordered that all monuments raised “to pride, prejudice, and tyranny”,⁴¹ whether in public places or private homes, were to be destroyed in the name of liberty. Widespread destruction of pre-revolutionary art continued throughout the period of the Terror, with artists themselves sometimes assisting in eradicating symbols of the old order.⁴²

At the same time an attempt was made, rather feeble at first, to preserve works of art from the old régime which had some special value. First the Commission of Monuments, later its successor, the Temporary Commission on the Arts, collected masterpieces with a view to preserving them in museums. While lamenting the fact that republican iconoclasm destroyed much of the art of the *ancien régime*, we must also concede the fact that the Revolution finally fulfilled the hope of many art lovers by creating an art museum in the Louvre, opened in August, 1793. One scholar has argued recently that this preservation of symbols from the former régime does not necessarily mean that republicans were inconsistent in their attitude toward art. He points out when these works were seen in a museum they ceased to be symbols and, torn out of their social context, became merely *objets d'art*.⁴³ This may be true in the case of a monument lifted from a public square and immured in a gallery, but the argument is not convincing in the case of paintings which were displayed in a museum in much the same way as in the ordinary *Salon*. In addition many of these symbols of royalty, aristocracy, and superstition were probably seen by more common citizens now that they were displayed in an art gallery than when they were in their proper setting during the *ancien régime*. But, however we interpret

⁴¹ Law passed August 14, 1792. Representatives of the communes were to oversee temporary preservation of works of art.

⁴² S. J. Idzerda, «Iconoclasm during the French Revolution», *American Historical Review*, LX (October, 1954), 13-26.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, p. 24.

the significance of the art museum, the preservation of some pre-revolutionary art was an admission that works of art had purely aesthetic values apart from, and in fact in spite of, their ideological content.

The survival of aesthetics in spite of a utilitarian theory of art can also be illustrated by the reviews of exhibitions written by exponents of the theory of art as propaganda. Several examples suggest themselves but perhaps the best are the reviews of the *Salons* of 1798 and 1799 by Chaussard in the *Décade philosophique*.⁴⁴ Chaussard was the author of an essay which contended that the dignity of the fine arts rested on the fact that they could serve as a means of public instruction.⁴⁵ In his reviews Chaussard emphasized this thesis repeatedly and praised those artists who treated republican themes. In his view historical painting should serve *la politique*, genre paintings should support *la morale*, and portraits ought to immortalize those who served the republic. Any work of art which was not instructive, which had no ideological message, he dismissed as wasted effort, or at least he claimed so in theory: "The arts ought to be a language for moral communication. Apart from such a point of view they are nothing more than sterile imitations. Let us never cease to repeat that the arts will become some day an active vehicle, a silent, but always eloquent, form of legislation."⁴⁶

Following our republican art critic around the *salons* we learn what he means. Whenever he found a painting with a political message he responded enthusiastically. He praised the ardent patriotism of *The Triumph of the French People on August Tenth* by Hennequin which portrayed the colossus Royalty, toppling under the feet of a giant symbolizing the People, while overhead Philosophy drives away Crime, Fanaticism, Credulity, Discord, and Envy. A classical theme such as *The Death of Caius Gracchus* by Topino Lebrun evoked his praises because it depicted wicked patricians, with daggers ready, attacking republicanism while a soothsayer, representing superstition, urges them on. He saluted the patriotic brush of Thévenin who had painted *Augereau on the Bridge at Arcole* because it showed a republican general, flag in hand and defying the crossfire of the enemy, leading his troops to victory, although our critic wondered if the general should have been distinguished so clearly from the other brave republicans. *The Fatherland in Danger* by Lethiers, the *Death of General Marceau* by Lebarbier the elder, and the *Loyalty of the French Hussards* by Vernet also met his demand for art with a political impact. On the whole he was disappointed

⁴⁴ P. J. B. Chaussard, «Exposition des ouvrages ... l'an VI», *Décade philosophique*, Vol. XVIII, l'an VI : No. 32, p. 274; No. 33, p. 335; No. 34, p. 410; No. 35, p. 465; No. 36, p. 535. «Exposition des ouvrages ... l'an VII», Vol. XXII, l'an VII, No. 36, p. 542; Vol. XXIII: No. 1, p. 36; No. 2, p. 94; No. 3, p. 212.

⁴⁵ *Supra*, note 40.

⁴⁶ *Décade*, Vol. XVIII, l'an VI, No. 34, p. 417.

at the small number of artists who had produced republican paintings. To remedy this situation he suggested that the government should use its patronage to guide art toward its proper purpose.

Since Chaussard thought that *genre* paintings should help to impress on the public those morals useful to a republic it is interesting to observe his responses to this type of painting. Like Diderot, he responded to those works which illustrated homely moral truths such as *Return to Virtue* by Drolling, which showed a young girl, respectable but humiliated, embracing the knees of her old father while the mother stands by with tear-filled eyes. However, as an offspring of the Enlightenment, our republican critic disapproved of the prayerbook, shown lying near the young girl, on the grounds that virtue inspired by sentiment was superior to that dictated by religion. A few other titles, *A Mother Explaining Emile to her Daughter* by Pajou, *A Scholar Studying his Lesson* by Bonnemaïson, or a *Lesson in Agriculture* by Vincent, suffice to show what was meant by *la morale en peinture*. As an austere republican Chaussard disapproved heartily of *A Printer's Shop* by Senave because, instead of idealizing the printing trade, the artist had made the shop look like a tavern. A *peintre philosophe* would have made the most of such a subject. In the foreground a man of genius would have been shown meditating over a proof, while in the background workmen would have been depicted intent on their respectable task. In the background there would have been a bust of Franklin, and on the floor the *Almanach Royal* with its list of censors torn and lying in the dust.

However, despite this republican enthusiasm, Chaussard could not remain consistent to his utilitarian theories. The critic who in theory dismissed as "sterile imitation" all art without a political or moral message ends up admiring classical themes with absolutely no political message, pretty *genre* paintings with no didactic intent, and even still lifes and landscapes whose only merits were those of pure art. In one case we even find Chaussard confessing, without realizing how it shattered his theories, that art can be a relief from politics:

Ah! Too often grieved by the spectacle of pious or heroic assassinations which the historical painter is condemned to depict, does not one come to muse before a beautiful view or before a sentimental scene which *genre* presents; ah yes, often I have preferred shepherds to heroes, a landscape to a battle.⁴⁷

Here then was an unwilling tribute to a wider significance for art than mere preaching. Other republican critics also usually finished up by admiring art simply for the beauty of the form or the splendour of the colour. As the need to defend their work became less urgent, is it any wonder that artists continued to paint traditional subjects? Or,

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, Vol. XXIII, l'an VIII, No. 3, p. 213.

since there was no control over what the artist produced, is it any wonder that the public continued to demand art rather than propaganda ?

In conclusion, then, the aim of the Revolution was not simply to admit the masses to the enjoyment of art which previously had been the privilege of the rich, but rather to make art an instrument for impressing ideas on the minds of the people. Under the *ancien régime* there had been those who realized the value of art as a means of inspiring certain sentiments, but none had elaborated the idea as fully as it was during the Revolution. The concept provided artists with a theoretical defense against those who denounced the social influence of the arts, and at the same time it supplied an argument in favour of state assistance in a period when customary patronage was disintegrating. However, despite a number of works which can be held up as examples of republican art, we have seen that the idea was largely sterile. One reason was that the various governments lacked the financial resources, not to mention the stability, necessary to carry out the monumental programs which they planned. Also, many artists, while supporting the idea in theory, must have been afraid to treat political subjects because of the rapidly changing revolutionary credo. But the principal reasons for this relative sterility lay in the unsolved, indeed unrecognized, tensions to which the idea of art as a social weapon gave birth, the contradiction between artistic freedom and social utility and the antithesis between art for the sake of ideology and *l'art pour l'art*. For fulfillment, therefore, the idea of art as propaganda had to await more modern times when certain governments, in the sphere of art at least, have been more ruthless, more consistent, than the men of the French Revolution.

COLONIES RIPE FOR REVOLT: THE OLDER BRITISH NORTH AMERICAN COLONIES IN 1763*

LAWRENCE H. GIPSON
Lehigh University

In this paper I shall attempt to clarify two things. One is that no one can calculate in advance with clarity the ultimate effects of a great war upon a nation and its political dependencies, if it possesses any. The other is the dilemma that can arise when a mother country suddenly finds herself in possession of mature offspring no longer willing to be kept in leading strings. I am sure that when the world war (which I call the *Great War for the Empire* in my writings) began in 1754, no British statesman in that year would have dreamed that within a little over a decade after its termination in 1763, Great Britain would have to face the fact that her American colonials no longer treated her government as that of a protecting parent but rather as that of a wicked and tyrannical enemy.

* * *

[Professor Gipson introduced his paper with the above statement. What follows is a *précis* prepared under his direction. Editor's note.]

The paper was concerned with analysing the visible and psychological changes which took place within the Empire and especially in North America as an aftermath of nine years of war between 1754 and 1763. On the geographical side the changes encompassed the tripling in size of the territories previously recognized to be embraced within the Empire and the expansion of its potentials to a degree that would justify its being called *the great Empire* of that day. However, this expansion brought with it problems of colonial administration that were to prove to be insuperable. Among these was the need of providing the royal and proprietary colonies with the type of government better suited to the degree of maturity they had achieved, dealing justly with the Indians who had deserted their French allies in favour of the British, creating a system of defence for North America commensurable with its importance and the potential dangers facing it, and finally, finding the financial resources to this end and for the honouring of the Great War

* This paper will form the introductory chapter to Volume X of Professor Gipson's series, *The British Empire before the American Revolution*, projected to appear in 1961 under the Borzoi imprint, Alfred A. Knopf, Inc. (New York), which has published Vols. IV - IX and Vol. 1, Revised (1936-58).

debt. In fact, a solution of some of these problems was irreconcilable with an effective solution of some of the others just enumerated.

Certain additional effects of the Great War for the Empire included the conversion of a group of immature, rather isolated British North American colonies into a much more closely-knit group of fairly mature commonwealths. They were now held together by common ties of military defence created during the late war and by improved means of intercommunication — through the expansion of roads, the postal services, the press, and intercolonial business and cultural relations. Between 1753 and 1775, for example, in these colonies there were some 43 newspapers in existence for brief or fairly long periods and in all some 4,467 distinct publications were issued with an American colonial imprint. Such publications, in addition to providing news from abroad, were chiefly concerned with local issues up to 1763. From then on they became the chief mediums for voicing criticism of the British government. This reached such a degree of intensity by 1774 and so powerfully influenced the attitude of colonials that the question may fairly be raised as to whether there would have been an American Revolution during this period without this free press.

A new sense of self-sufficiency of the colonies manifested by 1763 was based upon a feeling of political, economic, and social maturity as well as upon the rapid growth in population and the manner in which new immigrants were assimilated to what may be called the American pattern of life — a pattern that, in many ways, was sharply diverging from the English pattern. It was also based upon what was to British North Americans a new sense of security by that year with the elimination from Canada, the area east of the Mississippi, and Florida of the former French and Spanish threats to life and property. In its place there were now visions of an unlimited western expansion in North America of the English-speaking people.

While the southern colonies continued a plantation-type economy, industrialization was beginning to take hold in the more northern colonies. Economic expansion was keeping pace with the wealth accruing from such activities as land speculation, the marketing of the great staples of southern agriculture, the fisheries, the Indian trade, and the production of ships, naval stores, iron and steel, as well as from other profitable activities such as the great provision trade of the middle colonies. In short, in the words of Professor Gipson: "British North America by 1763 was no longer in a state of infancy. In fact, it had now become a young giant as the result of the extraordinarily favourable conditions under which it had been permitted to flourish."

Typical of the cultural flowering of the period was the collection and utilization of books in public and private libraries. Benjamin

Franklin's experiments in electricity were representative of a growing interest in science on the part of many Americans. The existence by 1763 of six colleges attested the interest in higher education of the North American colonials and their capacity to support it. A considerable number of students moreover went abroad to study in English and Scottish universities. In the field of religion the influence of Calvinism was spreading chiefly through Presbyterian and Baptist channels, especially in the back-country. The importance of this lies in the fact that its theological tenets posed a threat to continued British imperial control of Americans despite the growing tendency of Congregationalists in New England to drift away from its predestinarianism. Other Christian faiths had varying impacts and influences, often of a regional nature. Various groups of non-English immigrants likewise left deep imprints of their peculiar culture in the areas in which they settled.

However, it was the presence of the African Negro and the institution of slavery that had the most profound influence in altering the basically English culture patterns of the older North American colonies. While indentured whites formed an important part of the labour force, especially in the middle colonies, the Negro slave constituted a unique colonial class because of his low legal and social status. Indeed, the holding of slaves played a prominent part in the development of what one may call a British North American élite, which by 1763, and in spite of liberal franchise requirements in a number of colonies, rather effectively controlled all the colonial governments, from the post of governor or that of assemblyman to that of town selectman or vestryman.

That an impasse in the orderly and peaceful processes of government was destined to arise soon after 1763 may be attributed largely to a fundamental constitutional defect. This was the inability of the mother country to adjust imperial administrative policy and with it legislation — originally conceived for a group of separated, weak dependencies — to fit the needs of the mature group of closely-related colonies that had evolved in British North America by 1763. Political inequality of the almost two million inhabitants of the American colonies, especially in the light of their lack of representation in the House of Commons, could no longer be ignored. Nevertheless, the constitutional framework of the British Empire, as it stood in 1763, did not admit of any easy alteration to solve the problem of political inequality. Although proposals were made from time to time for colonial representation in Parliament, any effective representation could only have come about through drastic changes in the British constitution, including the destruction of Parliament as it then existed, and the substitution of something strikingly different. Were one to assume that the British Government had been prepared to take such a drastic step in 1763 or thereafter, it is probable that this would not have satisfied the colonials, any more than they would have welcomed a North American political union in 1763, as the fate of the

Albany Plan of Union of 1754 in their own assemblies had indicated. Professor Gipson's conclusion is that the only way to have preserved the old British Empire at all would have been to have given the colonials a free choice of remaining a part of it on their own terms or of peacefully separating from it. And he closed by asking: "What statesman was prepared in 1763 to offer a solution that only in our own days has been tried and has proved to be a source of strength rather than weakness to the parent country ? "

BRITISH AND INDIAN ATTITUDES TO THE INDIAN PROBLEM AT THE END OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

P. HARNETTY

University of British Columbia

The rise of national self-consciousness in India during the nineteenth century was a gradual process whose origins can be traced back to Raja Ram Mohun Roy and the Brahmo Samaj which he founded in Calcutta in 1828. Not for well over half a century, however, did this feeling find distinct institutional expression in the Indian National Congress, established in Poona in 1885. Both western influences derived from English education and indigenous influences derived from Hindu religious and social reform movements were responsible for the new feeling of national awareness which was behind the formation of the Congress. The liberalism which Indians learned from their familiarity with Western, and particularly English, political thought, provided the intellectual basis for their demand for gradual emancipation. At the same time, this claim was reinforced by a newly-awakened pride and sentiment which sprang from religious and social reform movements which developed after the middle of the nineteenth century, and which were at the same time a reaction against the values of the West and a reassertion of ancient values. Many of the leaders of thought in this period stressed the importance of social and spiritual freedom as the essential preliminary to political freedom, and they did so because they desired a restoration of ancient values native to the soil. Some were prepared to use English education as an agency to this end; others wished to eschew it entirely since they felt it would impede that restoration. But all schools of thought were wedded to the idea of the development of national feeling and, if their means to achieve this object were not the same, they all had the same end in view.

In the light of subsequent events, it is curious to reflect that the Indian National Congress was founded with official approbation. The preliminary work was done by A. O. Hume, a retired civil servant and a nephew of Joseph Hume, the British philosophic radical. The task to which he dedicated himself on his retirement in 1832 was the uplift of the masses from their condition of poverty and misery, and it was for this reason that he originally projected the Congress as an instrument of social reform. However, the Viceroy, Lord Dufferin, whom he had consulted beforehand, had advised him to take up the work of political organization instead, both in order to provide the government with a means of keeping in touch with public opinion, and because social reform

propaganda raised issues which could best be dealt with on a local rather than on a national basis.¹

The resolutions passed by the first session of the Congress were of a moderate nature, and mostly concerned with enlargement of the scope, functions, and size of the Supreme and Provincial Legislative Councils which had been set up under legislation passed in 1861. Indeed, the Viceroy himself was beginning to think along these lines and early in 1886, soon after the first session of Congress was over, Lord Dufferin wrote a Minute expressing his view of what policy towards the new organization should be. "My own inclination would be to examine carefully and seriously the demands which are the outcome of these various movements", he wrote, "to give quickly and with a good grace whatever it may be possible or desirable to accord, to announce that these concessions must be accepted as a final settlement of the Indian system for the next ten or fifteen years."^{1a}

This attitude of affable toleration of Congress continued until 1887, after which a change set in. Hume was impatient for results and came to the conclusion that the best method by which Congress could secure its political and economic ends was to set on foot an agitation similar to that conducted by the Anti-Corn Law League in England forty years before. Elaborate preparations were made for the third session of Congress in 1887 which was to be held in Madras. In the Punjab, for example, public meetings were held to stir up enthusiasm for the Congress, and according to an official report, the leading part in calling these meetings was taken in most places by subordinate Indian officials.² In Madras Presidency, every town of over 10,000 inhabitants was asked to form a Congress sub-committee, and arrangements were made for the distribution of half a million pamphlets, one of which bore the title *A Congress Catechism*.³

The resolutions passed at the Madras session resembled those previously passed at the Bombay and Calcutta sessions in 1885 and 1886, but the honeymoon period in Government-Congress relations quickly came to an end. Allahabad had been chosen as the meeting-place of the 1888 session of Congress, and Hume made a speech in that city on April 30, 1888 in which he advocated mass propaganda by the Congress on the lines of the Anti-Corn Law League.⁴ This drew forth a reply from

¹ Sir William Wedderburn, *Allan Octavian Hume* (London, 1913), p. 59.

^{1a} Sir Alfred Lyall, *The Life of the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava* (2 vols., London, 1905), II, 56.

² Government of Punjab to Government of India, September 2, 1887. India, Home Proceedings (Public), April 1888, nos. 363-394.

³ For Congress activities in Madras, see the introduction to the *Report of the Proceedings of the Third Indian National Congress* (Madras, 1887), pp. 10-15.

⁴ *A Speech on the Indian National Congress, its Origins, Aims and Objects* (Calcutta, 1888).

the Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces, Sir Auckland Colvin, in which he stated, in an open letter to Hume, that his early sympathy for the Congress had received a severe check when its campaign became aggressive on the model of the Anti-Corn Law League. Colvin argued that such tactics were premature in India, for they excited hatred against the Government and would serve to arouse a counter-agitation (on the part of the Muslims) which would divide the country into hostile camps.⁵ Hume denied these charges and claimed that in fact Congress was binding into harmonious co-operation men who had scarcely met previously except to quarrel. Hindu-Muslim discord did not arise from Congress agitation but from a few ill-advised officials who clung to the doctrine of "divide and rule". Congress, said Hume, represented the culture and intelligence of the country who saw danger ahead in the misery of the masses and in the bitter resentment of the educated class. He admitted that there was a certain risk in the agitation and that circumstances were not wholly favourable, but time was short.

Opposition to Hume's tactics came from middle-class Indians as well. An example of this is Bipin Chandra Pal, an English-educated Bengali who, like many young Bengalis of his generation, was a social idealist who desired a reconstruction of Hindu society on lines suitable to the conditions of the nineteenth century. Politically, he was a liberal who believed in the continuance of British rule in order to ensure the political and social advancement of the Indian people. Pal supported Colvin's stand, both in a letter to the press and in a public lecture delivered in Allahabad on the eve of the Congress session in December.⁶ His attitude to the Hume-Colvin controversy is interesting because less than fifteen years later he was to emerge as one of the foremost spokesmen of the "extremist" party in Indian politics which demanded the immediate termination of British rule. His complete change of front from a sincere supporter to an ardent opponent of British rule is a measure of the discontent which developed amongst educated Indians as a result of British indifference to the claims of the nationalist movement in the closing years of the nineteenth century.

Official displeasure with the Congress was pronounced by the Viceroy in a speech delivered at a St. Andrew's Day dinner in Calcutta on the eve of his retirement in 1888. He referred to the Congress as a "microscopic minority" and added: "surely the sensible man of the country cannot imagine that even the most moderate constitutional changes can be effected in such a system as ours by a stroke of the pen, or without

⁵ *Audi Alteram Partem : Two Letters on Certain Aspects of the Indian National Congress Movement* (Simla and London, 1888), p. 24.

⁶ B.C. Pal, *Memories of My Life and Times* (2 vols., Calcutta, 1932 and 1951), II, 32.

the most anxious deliberations, as well as careful discussions in Parliament.”⁷

The British attitude towards the Congress in these early years was to a considerable extent conditioned by the view that India was a “sacred trust” committed to Great Britain as part of her civilizing mission in the world. This attitude was a reflection of the general revival in imperial interest which had been gathering momentum since the late ‘sixties and which saw the British Empire not as a conglomeration of territories existing solely for the benefit of Great Britain, but as a positive force for good in the world which it was the white man’s burden to rule.

Indians, in fact, were not insensible to the benefits conferred on them by British rule; what they wanted was a greater share in ruling. All Congressmen in the early years were prepared for a policy of gradualness. Nor were they unaware of their own weaknesses. In 1889, for instance, a penetrating analysis of the strength and weakness of the Congress movement was published in Benares by an Indian writer, Bireshwar Mitter.⁸ Mitter, who was no anti-nationalist, drew attention to the division of Indian society into a numerous orthodox party, and a small section of “Young India”. This marked the line of distinction between the majority, not affected by Western science and civilization, and the minority who had benefitted by their influence. He argued that there were such multitudinous grounds of discord among the various races of India that peace and amity between them could only be secured through the instrumentality of a powerful unifying force which could rise superior to all elements of disunion, and, though itself unaffected by them, would be persistent and irresistible in its operation. Congress did not provide such a unifying force, for the fundamental principle of union among its members owed its existence solely to the conditions of things brought about by the changes effected by British rule in India. It was composed of some of the leading men of every race in India, but its members did not acquire their capacity for representation by virtue of their being Mahrattas, Bengalis, Rajputs, and so on, but because they held opinions on political matters in consonance with the expressed views of the Congress. “The nationality is lost in the intellectual character of the man, and that character, it cannot be denied, is due to the civilizing influence of British rule.”⁹

Mitter also appealed for a greater spirit of understanding on the part of the authorities towards the Congress movement, for the opinions of the representatives of a class which had received all the advantages of West-

⁷ *Speeches Delivered in India, 1884-8, by the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava* (London, 1890), p. 245.

⁸ Bireshwar Mitter, *A View of the Indian National Congress* (Benares, 1889).

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 8.

ern learning and culture were entitled to respect. Lansdowne, during his viceroyalty (1889-1894), was inclined to take a cautiously tolerant view of the movement and its activities. In 1891, for example, he expressed the strong opinion that it would not be in the Government's interest to show any animus against the Congress, and so long as it acted within constitutional limits to accept it good humouredly as representing the view of the advanced party in Indian politics. With a free press and the right of public meeting there would always be some organization of this kind to deal with, and nothing would so well serve to keep the movement alive as exhibitions of hostility on the part of the Government of India.¹⁰ Two months later, Hume wrote to the Viceroy complaining that Government officials sowed distrust of the Congress in the minds of the masses. That there was validity in this charge can be gathered from the fact that Lansdowne himself had earlier written to Sir Steuart Bayley, a member of the Council of India in London and a former Lieutenant-Governor of Bengal, deploring the fact that many officials made no effort to conceal their thoughts from the Congress. "It is this bitterness and intolerance which, I believe, give the Congress its strength, and render it a possible source of danger and an undoubted source of mischief and irritation."¹¹

It almost seemed as if the authorities believed that the policy of ignoring Congress was enough to ensure its decline. Thus in 1896 Lord George Hamilton, who held office as Secretary of State for India from 1895 to 1903, wrote to the Viceroy, Lord Elgin (1894-1898), expressing his gratification that the Congress, as a political power, had steadily gone down in the last few years. This was largely due, he thought, to the indifference and unconcern with which the Government of India had tolerated its proceedings.¹² Not long afterwards, Hamilton told the Viceroy that the more he saw and heard of the National Congress Party the more he was impressed with the seditious and double-sided character of that organization.¹³ Elgin, however, was not disposed to pass a hasty judgment on the Congress. He defended his policy of having Congressmen in the Legislative Councils,¹⁴ and considered that the leading men of the Congress party, when brought face to face with problems of practical administration, were inclined to deal with them reasonably.¹⁵

¹⁰ Lansdowne to Cross, January 28, 1891. Lansdowne Papers, Series I (Correspondence with the Secretary of State, 5 vols.), iiib, No. 5B.

¹¹ Lansdowne to Bayley, February 14, 1891, *ibid.*, Series II (Correspondence with Persons in England, 5 vols.), iiib, No. 18.

¹² Hamilton to Elgin, December 11, 1896. Hamilton Papers, Series Ia (Letters to Lord Elgin, 3 vols., numbered i-iii), i, No. 75. (These MSS are catalogued in the India Office Library under the title Private Correspondence, India. In order to avoid confusion with the private correspondence of Lord Elgin and Lord Lansdowne, they are referred to throughout as the Hamilton Papers).

¹³ Hamilton to Elgin, June 24, 1897, *ibid.*, Ia, ii, No. 115.

¹⁴ Elgin to Hamilton, April 21, 1897, *ibid.*, Series Ib (Letters from Lord Elgin, 12 vols., numbered i-xii), iv, No. 100.

¹⁵ Elgin to Hamilton, December 30, 1897, *ibid.*, Ib, viii, No. 173.

In June 1899 Curzon, who had recently succeeded Elgin as Viceroy, forwarded to the Secretary of State a report which had been drawn up at Hamilton's request on the influence which the newspaper *India*, published in England by the British Committee of the Congress, exercised over the Indian press. According to this report there was evidence to show that Congress received financial support from a number of princes and other prominent Indians. These included the Gaekwar of Baroda, one of the three premier chiefs; J. N. Tata, the industrialist; and the late Maharajah of Darbhanga, a wealthy Bengal *zemindar*. The Gaekwar frankly admitted, during a personal interview with Curzon, that he had subscribed 1,000 rupees annually towards the Congress funds. Amongst the reasons he gave was the fact that the bulk of educated opinion in India was in favour of the Congress, and he claimed that other chiefs also contributed to it.¹⁶

It would seem, therefore, that the Congress was more powerful than Hamilton professed to believe, and was supported by prominent Indians in all walks of life. The *Lucknow Advocate*, for instance, drew the attention of its readers on June 3, 1899 to the fact that six well-known Congressmen were, or had been, judges of different High Courts. Curzon quickly pointed out to the Secretary of State that these appointments were made exclusively upon the professional merits of the persons concerned, but it must have been disconcerting for the Government of India to realize that these admittedly capable persons were members of an organization whose leaders were regarded by both the Secretary of State and the Viceroy as seditious. As Curzon put it in September 1899: "But surely the whole of our case against that party is this, that it is in no sense a representative national body, as it claims to be, — that, if not actively disloyal to the British government in this country, it is, at any rate, far from friendly to it."¹⁷

The question of "loyalty" was, of course, fundamental to the whole issue between Congress and the Government. The Congress had commenced its career amidst solemn professions of its loyalty, and it did not consider that the reforms for which it asked — a greater elective element in the Councils, whose powers would be enlarged; and a greater number of Indians in the higher ranks of the Indian Civil Service — were inconsistent with these declarations. Yet it was not long before its

¹⁶ Curzon to Hamilton, July 17, 1899, *ibid.*, Series IIb (Letters from Lord Curzon, 14 vols., numbered xiii-xxvi), xiv, No. 31 (encl.). As early as May 1889 Lansdowne had written regarding the Congress that "there was every reason to believe that many of the Chiefs and leading men do not regard its proceedings with disfavour, but are giving it secret assistance and encouragement. Even some of those who are ostensibly hostile or neutral are, for reasons not difficult to fathom, maintaining amicable relations with the leaders of the 'progressive party'." "Note on Reform of Provincial Legislative Councils", dated May 4, 1889. Lansdowne Papers, Series IV (Notes and Minutes), 46.

¹⁷ Curzon to Hamilton, September 27, 1899. Hamilton Papers, IIb, xv, No. 40.

program was being equated with disloyalty and even sedition. Most educated Indians were loyal not only by nature and in accordance with the genius of their civilization but, in the words of a contemporary Indian writer, Malur Rangacharya, "under the imperious pressure of their immediate interests."¹⁸ The British suspicion that Indians were disloyal was due to their lack of understanding: the rulers of India rarely knew well the Indian nature, and their very position as rulers made it difficult for them to fraternize with Indians, learn their inner feelings, aspirations, and habits of thought, and in consequence be able to sympathize with them. The complexities of Indian life appeared mystic and uncouth to the Englishman, who, failing to understand his environment, withdrew from all contact with it and lived a self-satisfied insular life in which prejudice was perpetuated and strengthened.

According to Rangacharya, the large question of the Indian people's loyalty to British rule was chiefly determined by the attitude adopted by the Indian Civil Service. In earlier years these civil servants set the example for all other British people in India to follow in their direct and indirect dealings with Indians, but in recent years they had given way to others of British birth who, though living in India, had no serious political responsibility of any kind to bear. This non-official Anglo-Indian society was now larger than ever before and wielded, through its consolidated public opinion, an enormous amount of power to influence the tendency of Anglo-Indian official thought and life, and thus determine the attitude of the rulers to the ruled. The increasing demands of educated Indians to be allowed a greater share in the governing of their own country had injected feelings of jealous rivalry against them in the minds of officialdom. Hence the Indian reputation for loyalty was discoloured not merely by the insular habits of the British in India, but also by the struggle between the haves and the have-nots for the patronage at the disposal of the state.

This Indian view can be supported from other sources. For example, Hugh Childers, a Conservative member of Parliament who toured India during Lansdowne's time, praised the evident efficiency of the Indian Civil Service, but criticized the way in which Indians as a class were regarded by younger officers, especially army officers, and the way many of these officers showed their dislike, and sometimes contempt for them.¹⁹ Lansdowne himself was often struck, upon the occasion of such social gatherings as were attended by both Europeans and Indians, by the extraordinary indifference shown by the former to the latter. As a rule, there was little attempt at fusion between the two, and if a civil word was addressed to an Indian, it was done in a patronizing and perfunctory

¹⁸ M. Rangacharya, *The Indian Loyalty* (Madras, 1898), p. 37.

¹⁹ Childers to Lansdowne, February 15, 1890. Lansdowne Papers, Series III (Correspondence with Persons in India, 10 vols.), iiii, No. 152.

manner.²⁰ Sir Charles Crosthwaite, who ended a long and distinguished career as Lieutenant-Governor of the North-Western Provinces (1892-1895) and who then served on the Council of India (1895-1905), when asked by Hamilton to sum up his experiences in India replied: "I came away knowing nothing whatever of the inner feelings and thoughts of the people amongst whom I had lived for many years."²¹

Both Elgin and Curzon shared Rangacharya's view that the growth of non-official Anglo-Indian society was largely responsible for the steady deterioration of relations between the rulers and the ruled. Elgin, for example, drew Hamilton's attention to the attitude taken by the Anglo-Indian newspaper *The Englishman* to a riot which occurred in Calcutta in July 1897. Instead of trying to allay fears, it had opened its columns to the wildest exaggerations and had rivalled the worst of them in its leading articles.²² Curzon, in a characteristic satirical sally, wrote that in ordinary times the Anglo-Indian was a good fellow, addicted, in the intervals of his business hours, to playing polo or golf, to imbibing strong drinks, and to mild denunciation of the Government. "As soon as any question arises, affecting, as he thinks, his prestige as a member of the superior race, he becomes an excitable fanatic, destitute of reason, fairness, or even common sense."²³

Curzon, in particular, was troubled by this problem of the relations between the British and the people they ruled. In his letters to Hamilton, he often talked about the position of the British Government in India, of its relations with Indians, and of the way in which they were affected by the changes passing over British habits and life. Towards the end of his first term of office (1899-1904), he sent the Secretary of State a statement of the case from the Indian point of view which, he said, showed greater knowledge and insight than anything on the subject he had yet seen in an Indian journal.²⁴

The article in question was written by Bipin Chandra Pal, and it appeared in the *Hindustan Review* in June 1903.²⁵ Pal began by emphasizing the gravity of the situation created in India by repeated failures of justice in cases concerning European criminals. The chief strength of the British Government in India had always consisted in the impression it had been able to create in the popular mind regarding its justice and benevolence. England, said Pal, had really won the trust of the people of India, but the question now was whether she had been able

²⁰ Lansdowne to Childers, February 21, 1890, *ibid.*, III, iiib, No. 111.

²¹ Hamilton to Curzon, February 20, 1902. Hamilton Papers, Series IIa (Letters to Lord Curzon, 5 vols., numbered i-v), iv, No. 8.

²² Elgin to Hamilton, July 14, 1897, *ibid.*, Ib, vi, No. 125.

²³ Curzon to Hamilton, September 9, 1903, *ibid.*, IIb, xxvi, No. 37.

²⁴ Curzon to Hamilton, August 12, 1903, *ibid.*, IIb, xxvi, No. 33.

²⁵ B.C. Pal, "Criminal Justice between Europeans and Indians". *Hindustan Review*, VII (No. 6, June, 1903), 515-521.

fully to retain it. The old spell was fast breaking, for the generation that had witnessed the change from anarchy and misrule to settled order and government had passed away. With them had gone the old memories in family or village traditions which nourished these sentiments of trust. The Government, however, had failed to forge new bonds of sympathy between the rulers and the ruled. Furthermore, the old foundations of British rule — the education of Indians in the arts of self-government, as propounded in the Royal Proclamation of 1858 — had been consciously, though gradually shifted; and all aspects of the British administration, even when benevolent, were viewed in an entirely new light not flattering to British character or policy. This deterioration of British character, whether real or imaginary, constituted a political danger of the utmost gravity.

Pal continued that the patient forbearing and silent fortitude of the Indian masses in face of poverty and starvation were really due to the hypnotic spell that the British had cast over them from almost the very commencement of their rule. It was this spell which was being broken by the maladministration of criminal justice in regard to offences committed by Europeans against Indians, because such maladministration destroyed the reputation established by the British government for justice and benevolence, on which the strength of British rule had always depended. England's power in India rested more on the prestige of character than of arms. As this prestige diminished in Indian eyes, and as the people lost their confidence in the justice and benevolence of their alien rulers, the threat of lawlessness became more real and, with it, an almost complete deadlock in the administration.

Once again, these Indian views find confirmation from the official records. Three years before Pal wrote this article, Curzon wrote to Hamilton: "I have discussed with you, in many letters, the difficulties that have to be encountered in this country to secure even justice between Europeans and Natives in the Courts."²⁶ In the very month that Pal's article appeared, Curzon wrote to the Secretary of State about a series of four assaults in one week by British soldiers on Indians, in two of which death had resulted, and he expressed his opinion that there would be no change in this state of affairs until a British soldier was hanged for murdering an Indian.²⁷ Hamilton, too, was impressed by Pal's article, which he commended for its ability and moderation. He seized upon it to develop a favourite theme of his — the declining quality of the civil service and the serious problem this posed for the future of British rule in India:

²⁶ Curzon to Hamilton, October 17, 1900. Hamilton Papers, I Ib, xviii, No. 47. Curzon related in this letter how the High Court of Calcutta itself had just failed in a case involving the murder of a tea-plantation coolie by a European.

²⁷ Curzon to Hamilton, June 17, 1903, *ibid.*, I Ib, xxvi, No. 25.

The perusal of an article like this aggravates my pessimism as regards the future of India. We established our rule and extended our authority throughout India by being fortunate enough to secure, as our agents, men of exceptionable attainments and exceptionable character, and these attributes were not confined to the highest of our agents, but were shared by many in humbler spheres of employment; and now there is a far larger proportion of what might be termed "mean whites" — men taken from quite the lower stratum of middle-class life, who simply go out to try and make, as rapidly as possible, a livelihood in India, from which they wish to return as quickly as possible.²⁸

The lack of understanding which Hamilton attributed to the contemporary civil service was due, he thought, to the undisputed control exercised by the British over the whole country, backed by a strong army. This was in contrast to the older and less perfect system which civil servants in former days had to administer when, in consequence of the isolation in which they found themselves, they were compelled to consider, and if possible to utilize, the peculiarities of constitution and temperament of the leading Indians in their vicinity.²⁹ Another reason for the changing character of the civil service was the quickening of the communications between England and India consequent upon the opening of the Suez canal. England became more and more the home of the Indian officer, and the wonderful knowledge of the characteristics of Indians once possessed by so many of the old school of political officers was becoming a thing of the past.³⁰

Lord George Hamilton ascribed the rut into which the administration had settled to the influence of the utilitarians and the Manchester School. He felt that there was a great deal that was good in the financial and commercial policy of the utilitarians; but, when they went outside finance and endeavoured to lay down principles both for the internal and external administration of the Empire, in his judgment they then broke down, since they made no allowance for sentiment, for tradition, or for the inherent instincts of governing and fighting races.³¹ The centralized system of administration which had developed in India since the Crown assumed direct responsibility for the government of India had turned the Indian official into something resembling a French bureaucrat, and the civil service was rapidly coming to resemble the bureaucratic system which prevailed in France. The old-fashioned civilians had been constantly in touch with the people, whereas the modern official, kept perpetually at his desk by an enormous mass of correspondence, with less chance to go outside, tended to deal in a stereotyped, systematic, logical manner with all appeals and questions which came before him.³²

²⁸ Hamilton to Curzon, September 2, 1903, *ibid.*, IIa, v, No. 35.

²⁹ Hamilton to Elgin, September 17, 1896, *ibid.*, Ia, i, No. 63.

³⁰ Hamilton to Elgin, July 8, 1897, *ibid.*, Ia, ii, No. 119.

³¹ Hamilton to Amphill, September 17, 1902. Amphill Papers, V.

³² Hamilton to Amphill, April 10, 1902, *ibid.*, V.

There was another aspect of the civil service question which caused the policy-makers concern both in India and Great Britain: the number of Indians in the civil service. One of the major aims of the Congress party was to secure the admission of a higher proportion of Indians into the upper echelons of the service, and to secure the simultaneous holding of the entrance examinations in India as well as in England. The Congress agitation to this end met with no success; nevertheless, a small number of Indians did manage to enter the civil service after going to England and taking the examinations there. By the mid-'nineties, this intake was causing concern to the Government of India, which warned the Secretary of State in November 1893 and again in 1894 that it was necessary to keep a close watch on the proportion of Indians who entered the civil service by competition in London. At the same time, the Government of India expressed the view that it might become necessary to restrict the proportion of Indians in the service to 18 per cent or some similar figure.³³ Both of these despatches were signed by Lansdowne. Elgin, after he had been in the country eighteen months, recorded his impression that the British could only govern India by maintaining the fact that they were the dominant race. "Therefore it is that in civil administration, however much we may desire to introduce natives of India into the Government of their country, there is a point at which we must reserve control to ourselves, if we are to remain at all."³⁴

Five years later Curzon wrote to the Secretary of State about the extreme danger of the system under which every year an increasing number of the 900 and odd higher posts that were meant, and ought to have been exclusively and specifically reserved for Europeans, were being "filched away" by the superior wits of the Indian in the English examinations. This was the greatest peril with which the British administration was confronted in India.³⁵ Hamilton replied that he too was filled with apprehension by the increasing numbers of Indians in the service, a number that would continue to grow in the future. One of the greatest mistakes that had ever been made was the statement in the Royal Proclamation annexing India of the principle that perfect equality was to exist, so far as all appointments were concerned, between Europeans and Indians.³⁶

This concern over the personnel of the civil service grew from the necessity for ensuring the permanence of British control of India by retaining the key posts in the administration firmly in British hands. This was basic to the conflict which existed between the promises made

³³ Government of India to Secretary of State, Despatch No. 62 (Public), November 1, 1893. *Letters from India* (Public), vol. 18, (1893).

³⁴ Elgin to Rosebery, July 7, 1895. *Elgin Papers, Series II* (Correspondence with Persons in England, 5 vols.), iib, No. 51.

³⁵ Curzon to Hamilton, April 23, 1900. *Hamilton Papers*, Iib, xvi, No. 17.

³⁶ Hamilton to Curzon, May 17, 1900, *ibid.*, Iia, ii, No. 21.

in the past on the British side (notably in the Royal Proclamation of 1858), and accepted at their face value by the majority of educated Indians, and the pressing demands of the contemporary world situation. As Hamilton had pointed out, much of the difficulty arose from the influence exercised on the Indian political scene by the ideas, policy, and precepts of the utilitarians. This influence was not, however, confined to the practical expression of utilitarian theories, such as competitive examinations, but extended over the whole range of liberal idealism which had motivated the rulers of India in the earlier part of the nineteenth century. At that time, men such as Sir Thomas Munro, Sir John Malcolm, Mountstuart Elphinstone, and Lord William Bentinck, had viewed the "sacred trust" in terms of emancipation and the preparation for liberty rather than as justification for maintaining the *status quo*.

The Royal Proclamation of 1858 bore the stamp of mid-Victorian liberalism, but liberalism was on the wane by the end of the century, and in the changed political context of the new imperialism, the "Magna Carta of Indian Liberties" came to be viewed in an entirely different light. In 1897, for example, the Bishop of Madras suggested that the Royal Proclamation should be republished on the occasion of Queen Victoria's jubilee, since it would be of advantage to recall to the minds of the people of India the noble sentiments and gracious pledges it contained.³⁷ Elgin replied that the Bishop's idea was not a wise one. Circumstances had changed, and the India of 1897 was assuredly not the India of 1858. Furthermore, the Proclamation had been given a significance that had not been intended, and which directly impeded, or at any rate would impede if attended to, the Government of Her Majesty.³⁸

The India of 1897 was not the India of 1858, but then England had changed too. The decline of liberalism in imperial affairs must be viewed against the background of the changing scene in international politics and the relative decline in Great Britain's position in world affairs. Hamilton expressed his awareness of this change in a letter to Curzon in April 1902:

I may be pessimistic, but I do see most serious dangers ahead, not in the immediate future; but the immense development of the material prosperity of the world and the increase of production are enabling foreign nations in all parts of the world to more effectively compete with us. Our supremacy in many branches of life and work, which in the past has been uncontested, is now going, and it will require men of exceptionable capacity, resolution, and tenacity, to bridge over the time in which we shall pass, from the old position which we occupied in the nineteenth century to that which, if we are properly led and administered, I think the British Empire ought to occupy in the twentieth and succeeding centuries.³⁹

³⁷ Havelock to Elgin, April 5, 1897. Elgin Papers, Series III (Correspondence with Persons in India, 10 vols.), viia, No. 287.

³⁸ Elgin to Havelock, April 12, 1897, *ibid.*, III, viib, No. 254.

³⁹ Hamilton to Curzon, April 2, 1902. Hamilton Papers, IIa, iv, No. 14.

From Hamilton's point of view, the maintenance of British dominion in India was essential if the British Empire was to occupy its rightful position in the century just opening. Yet on more than one occasion he took the line that it was India which gained most from the imperial connection. Curzon, however, was quick to take issue with the Secretary of State, reminding him that India rendered conspicuous services to Great Britain without which for many imperial purposes the latter would be absolutely crippled.⁴⁰

The economic value of the Indian Empire also governed the British attitude to India, and to the claims of the Indian National Congress. In March 1894 the Government of India, in urgent financial straits, imposed a general 5 per cent duty on imports, but exempted cotton goods from this duty under extreme pressure from the British government.⁴¹ The position of an important British economic interest — the Lancashire cotton industry — was at stake and had to be protected; as the Permanent Under-Secretary of State for India, Sir Arthur Godley, commented at the time: "It is quite true that at this moment India is being sacrificed to Lancashire. I very much regret it, but I can see no help for it at this moment."⁴² When agitation in India made it necessary, in December 1894, to extend the import duty to cotton goods, the Government of India was obliged by the British Government to impose a countervailing excise duty on Indian-produced goods.⁴³ Even this did not satisfy Lancashire, and in February 1896 the Government of India was compelled to make further modifications, exempting cotton yarns from all taxes, and reducing the import and excise duties on woven goods from 5 to 3½ per cent.

The cotton duties controversy illustrated only one aspect of the economic ramifications of British rule in India. Several years earlier, in 1888, Dufferin had laid it down that the general conditions which governed British policy in India did not stop at the obligation placed upon the British government of providing for the safety and welfare of all the different groups and interests found within the boundaries of India. There was also the duty of watching over the enormous commercial interests of the "mother country", represented by a guaranteed capital of over 220 million pounds sterling, which, to the great benefit of India, had either been lent to the state, or sunk in Indian railways; and he went on:

...for, however freely we admit that India should be primarily governed in the interests of the Indian people, it would be criminal to ignore the

⁴⁰ Curzon to Hamilton, September 2, 1903. Hamilton Papers, IIb, xxvi, No. 36.

⁴¹ Secretary of State to Viceroy, private telegram, February 27, 1894. Elgin Papers, Series IV (Telegrams from and to Secretary of State, 5 vols.), ia, No. 52.

⁴² Godley to Babington Smith, April 6, 1894, *ibid.*, II, ia, No. 24. Babington Smith was private secretary to the Viceroy.

⁴³ "I need not emphasize what I am saying at length in the telegram; but I should like to emphasize that it is absolutely *essential* that the Excise Duty should be so fixed as to eliminate any possibility of protection." Fowler to Elgin, November 30, 1894, *ibid.*, I, ia, No. 34.

responsibility of the Government towards those who have sunk large sums of money in the development of Indian resources on the faith of official guarantees, or who have invested their capital in the Indians funds at the invitation of the Imperial Indian authorities.⁴⁴

The same consideration applied with almost equal force, added Dufferin, to that further vast amount of capital which was employed by private British enterprise in manufactures, in tea planting, and in the indigo, jute, and similar industries, on the assumption that English rule and English justice would remain dominant in India.

To a majority of Englishmen, faced with the compelling demands of national self-interest, the liberal ideal became irreconcilable with the maintenance of British rule in India. At the end of the nineteenth century, those responsible for the governance of India lacked the necessary vision to produce a workable solution to the Indian problem. Hamilton summed up his attitude in a letter to Lord Elgin late in 1896 when he declared that "beyond grumbling I have no remedy for the present state of things; but a generation hence the position will be worse, and how it is to end I cannot see, though during our lifetime the evil will be one of inconvenience rather than one of danger."⁴⁵ In the light of such a statement, it is scarcely surprising that Hamilton's approach was absolutely negative in dealing with the problem of Indian nationalism. He told Elgin that as regards legislation, either for purposes of consolidation or otherwise, the Viceroy could rely on him doing as little as he could, for he had a "holy horror" of Indian legislation which simply raised a "heap of anomalous questions."⁴⁶

The technique of "divide and rule" was behind much of Hamilton's approach to Indian affairs, as can be seen from his correspondence with Elgin and Curzon. For example, referring to the question of commissions for Indians in the Indian army, he held that in this respect Russia's example should be followed, for Russia opened almost endless advancement to her Central Asian subjects if they were of good birth and ability. Considerable advantages would accrue from the adoption of such a policy, for if the Government could keep the affection of the fighting races and higher orders of society in India, it could ignore the dislike and disaffection of the intellectual non-fighting classes — the *babus*, students, and pleaders.⁴⁷ Hamilton expressed the same view in a letter to Curzon two years later when he was discussing a scheme of modern Hindu

⁴⁴ "Minute by H.E. the Viceroy". Government of India to Secretary of State, Despatch No. 67 (Public), November 6, 1888 (encl. 3, p. 3). Letters from India (Public), vol. 9 (1888).

⁴⁵ Hamilton to Elgin, October 30, 1896. Hamilton Papers, Ia, i, No. 69.

⁴⁶ Hamilton to Elgin, September 6, 1895, *ibid.*, Ia, i, No. 10.

⁴⁷ Hamilton to Elgin, September 6, 1897, *ibid.*, Ia, ii, No. 139. Hamilton also praised Russia's example in another field: her denial of a free press. Hamilton to Curzon, August 3, 1899, *ibid.*, IIa, i, No. 30.

education, associated with definite religious and moral training, which Annie Besant had initiated in the North-Western Provinces:

I think the real danger to our rule in India, not now but say 50 years hence, is the gradual adoption and extension of Western ideas of agitation and organization; and if we could break the educated Indian party into two sections holding widely different views, we should, by such a division, strengthen our position against the subtle and continuous attack which the spread of education must make upon our present system of Government.⁴⁸

Hamilton was alarmed at the changes taking place in British politics; new ideas and forces were coming into operation whose consequences he could not foresee. As for himself, he confided to Curzon that he was beginning to feel the weight of years, in the sense of not caring to tackle and overcome difficult administrative questions as he used to do. Hence he found it a great delight to find Curzon keen and confident to deal with any question that might arise in India. "I am left to discharge the functions of an old foggy", he said, "namely, to encourage and occasionally to put the drag on."⁴⁹

Hamilton was shrewd enough to be aware of the changes which the passage of time must bring in India. Yet he followed a policy of negation during a period when, more than ever before, the problems raised by the development of national feeling in India required a positive and statesmanlike approach based on a sympathetic understanding of the various factors involved. Hamilton was baffled by his task and, when the Government of India was taken over by a man of Curzon's strength, he was quite content to let matters drift out of his control. This combination of Curzon and Hamilton was disastrous to British dominion in India. With a convinced imperialist at the helm in India and a tired and disillusioned Secretary of State in charge at the India Office, a crisis developed which ushered in a new era in Indian politics, both as regards the British attitude to the growing nationalist movement and within the movement itself over its own aims and objectives. To the disillusionment engendered in the educated Indian mind by British political and economic policy, and the ferment caused by the social and cultural forces at work, was added the bitterness of a head-on clash between the avowed and unrestrained imperialism of Lord Curzon and the advancing forces of developing Indian nationalism.

⁴⁸ Hamilton to Curzon, September 20, 1899, *ibid.*, IIa, i, No. 37.

⁴⁹ Hamilton to Curzon, January 5, 1900, *ibid.*, Ia, ii, No. 1.

NATIONAL HISTORIC PARKS AND SITES, 1958-59
BY THE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES DIVISION,
NATIONAL PARKS BRANCH,
DEPARTMENT OF NORTHERN AFFAIRS AND
NATIONAL RESOURCES

The National Historic Parks and Sites Division is responsible for the operation and maintenance of 20 National Historic Parks and for the care and preservation of 574 Historic Sites which have been erected since 1922, an average of $1\frac{1}{3}$ monuments per month for 36 years. The Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, comprised of authoritative historians from each province, advises the Minister on the marking of historic sites, the commemorating of persons and places, including buildings of national historic interest by reason of their age or architectural design.

During the year, the old Commissariat Building, 17 St. Louis Street, Quebec City, was acquired. Restoration of the house was begun early in 1959 and it is hoped work will be completed in the summer of 1959. Work at Cartier-Brébeuf Park, Quebec City, commissioned by the Historic Sites Division, was carried out by the National Battlefields Commission. Land was acquired at the Alexander Graham Bell Museum, Batoche, Fort Malden, Grand Pré and Signal Hill National Historic Parks. Negotiations for additional areas of land were continued at Fort Malden.

The program of erecting monuments to mark historic places, events and prominent figures in Canadian history was continued with the establishment of tablets at Kamouraska, Quebec; Parliament Buildings, Toronto; Windsor, Ontario; Gravelbourg, Saskatchewan; Victoria B.C.; University of Saskatchewan and Newcastle, N.B.

We would also wish to draw attention to the increasing genuine interest in the work of the Historic Parks and Sites Division. This year we have answered numerous inquiries on diverse topics of Canadian history. Persons of all ages, not only throughout Canada but also in the United States, have expressed a desire to have an intelligent knowledge of the history of Canada.

The Historic Parks and Sites Division is pleased to announce that Mr. Jack Douglas Herbert has been appointed as the new Chief of the Division. Mr. Herbert was recently with the Glenbow Foundation in Calgary. Born in Saskatoon in 1920, he later studied History (Honours) and Political Science at the University of Saskatchewan, and obtained his Master's Degree in History and Political Science at the University of Toronto.

The Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada held two General Meetings in Ottawa this year, one in November and one in May. The present members of the Board are as follows: Rt. Rev. Mgr. A. d'Eschambault, Genthon, Manitoba, (Chairman); Dr. Walter N. Sage, Vancouver, British Columbia; Dr. W. Kaye Lamb, Dominion Archivist, Ottawa, Ontario; Dr. A. G. Bailey, Dean of Arts, Fredericton, New Brunswick; Dr. C. B. Fergusson, Halifax, Nova Scotia; Richmond Mayson, Esq., Prince Albert, Saskatchewan; Edouard Fiset, Esq., Quebec, P.Q.; Jules Bazin, Esq., Montreal, P.Q.; O. L. Vardy, Esq., St. John's, Newfoundland; Dr. A. R. M. Lower, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario; Dr. D. G. Creighton, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario; Richard Y. Secord, Edmonton, Alberta, (recently appointed); J. D. Herbert, Chief, National Historic Parks and Sites Division, Ottawa, Ontario. (Secretary to the Board)

NATIONAL HISTORIC SITES:

TABLETS UNVEILED IN 1958-59

Honourable Jean Charles Chapais and his son Thomas, at St. Louis de Kamouraska, P.Q.

Meetings of the Parliament of Canada in Toronto prior to Confederation, Toronto, Ontario.

The François Baby House, Windsor, Ontario.

Father Louis-Pierre Gravel, Gravelbourg, Saskatchewan.

The Mooring Rings, Victoria, British Columbia.

Fort McLeod's Lake, British Columbia.

Arthur Silver Morton, University of Saskatchewan.

Peter Mitchell, Newcastle, New Brunswick.

NATIONAL HISTORIC PARKS

FORT ANNE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK situated in Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia, covers 31 acres. The museum building, restored in 1935, was originally the Officers' Quarters and was built in 1797-98 under the supervision of Edward, Duke of Kent, the father of Queen Victoria, when he was Commander-in-Chief of the British forces in Nova Scotia.

Registration of visitors was 30,443, an increase of 6,391 over last year.

PORT ROYAL HABITATION situated at Port Royal, near Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia, covers 20.5 acres. A replica of the original Port Royal Habitation marks the exact site where the first European settlement

in Canada, other than a mere trading post, was established in 1605 by the Sieur de Monts and Samuel de Champlain. Champlain himself chose the location and drew the picture of the building which was the chief source of information for the present replica.

Registration of visitors was 28,085, an increase of 4,644 over last year.

FORTRESS OF LOUISBOURG NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK situated about three miles from the town of Louisbourg, Cape Breton Island, Nova Scotia, covers 339.5 acres. Louisbourg was a focal point in the struggle between English and French in North America which culminated in the possession of Canada for the British Crown. Built by the French after the Treaty of Utrecht in 1713 and named in honour of their sovereign, Louis XIV, the fortress was twice captured by the British and destroyed after the final conquest in 1758. Archaeological research is presently being conducted at Louisbourg by Mr. Russell Harper.

Total number of visitors who signed the register was 25,796, an increase of 5,091.

HALIFAX CITADEL NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK (Halifax, Nova Scotia) situated on Citadel Hill, covers 37 acres and has a commanding view of the harbour and city. Four successive forts were built on its summit. The first was the strong point in a system of wooden block-houses and palisades around the young settlement, designed to protect the settlers from Indians. The second was built during the American Revolution as a stronghold against the rebels. The third was constructed when Napoleon Bonaparte was endeavouring to conquer the world, and the existing one was started in 1828. The Citadel has been declared a National Historic Park and for some years the fortress, which had fallen into disrepair, has been under restoration.

Visitors who signed the register numbered 237,259, an increase of 3,259 from the previous year.

FORT BEAUSEJOUR NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK, situated near Sackville, New Brunswick, covers 81 acres. Built by the French, the fort was intended to be a stronghold against the undefined claims of the English to Acadia. Around the fort the Acadians had their homes and farms. It was captured by the British under Monckton in 1755 and renamed Fort Cumberland, after which time it was strengthened and its defenses extended by a system of advance entrenchments, traces of which still remain.

Visitor registration at the museum was 16,051 an increase of 2,273 over last year.

FORT CHAMBLY NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK situated about twenty miles southeast of Montreal, on a conspicuous headland on the Richelieu River at Chambly, Quebec, covers 2.5 acres. The first fort, built by the French in 1665 as a protection against the Iroquois, was of wooden construction. It was later rebuilt of stone, this work being completed in 1771. In 1760 the fort was surrendered to the British, who, with a small garrison, occupied it until 1775. In that year the Americans captured the fort, but evacuated it the following year. The fort was soon afterwards repaired and garrisoned by Sir Guy Carleton and later played an important part in the war of 1812.

Visitors who signed the register in the museum numbered 56,804, a decrease of 16,161 from last year.

FORT LENNOX NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK, located on Ile-aux-Noix in the Richelieu River, can be reached only by boat. This park, covering 210 acres, is about thirteen miles south of St. John's, Quebec. The present fort, which stands near the site of one previously erected by the French and a second fort constructed during the Revolutionary War, was built by the Imperial authorities in the period from 1819 to 1827. The island was acquired for historic site purposes in 1921, and extensive work has since been carried out on the buildings and grounds.

Attendance registration showed 10,816 persons, a decrease of 2,519 from the previous year.

FORT WELLINGTON NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK covers 8.5 acres and is situated at the east end of the town of Prescott, Ontario, adjacent to Highway No. 2. The fort, named after the Duke of Wellington, was first erected when the British authorities decided to fortify Prescott as one of the most vulnerable points of attack in the War of 1812, and as the main base for the defence of communications between Kingston and Montreal. It remains as it was when finally completed in 1838, an impressive landmark.

18,839 visitors registered, an increase of 1,433 over last year.

WOODSIDE NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK at Kitchener, Ontario, covers 11 acres. Its center of interest is a characteristic house of the 1850's where the Rt. Hon. William Lyon Mackenzie King spent his boyhood years in the 1880's.

Attendance was 2,046, an increase of 762 over last year.

FORT MALDEN NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK in Amhersburg, Ontario, covers 5 acres. The original fort was built in 1797-99 by the Second Battalion, Royal Canadian Volunteers. It was strengthened in 1812 as the principal military station on the western frontier, and was

dismantled and abandoned in 1813. Only slight evidences of the original fortifications remain, but the existing earthworks and the only old building still standing date from as early as 1823.

28,855 visitors signed the museum register, which records an increase of 7,658 over last year.

LOWER FORT GARRY NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK situated on the west bank of the Red River about twenty miles north of Winnipeg, Manitoba, comprises an area of approximately 13 acres. It was built between 1831 and 1839 by the Hudson's Bay Company and, although never besieged, played an important part in meeting the threat of war and rebellion. Indian Treaty No. 1 was signed there on August 3, 1871. It remained a place of considerable importance until about 1882, when the head of navigation for the Red River was removed from there to old Colville Landing on the opposite side of the river near Selkirk. It was transferred to the Canadian Government in 1951, subject to the continuance of a lease of the buildings and grounds to the Motor Country Club for a further period.

The park is open to the public May 1st to October 31st. Hours are Monday to Friday 10:00 A.M. to 6:00 P.M. and Saturdays, Sundays and statutory holidays 10:00 A.M. to 5:00 P.M.

15,000 people visited the fort during the year, a decrease of 6,300 from last year.

FORT BATTLEFORD NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK situated in the Townsite of Battleford, four miles south of the City of North Battleford, Saskatchewan, comprises an area of 37 acres. The buildings include the Superintendent's House, Inspector's Cottage, Guard Room, Hospital, Stable and Barracks. Only the first-mentioned building was part of the original Mounted Police Post which was established there in 1876 by Colonel James Walker, and linked up with such posts as MacLeod, Fort Walsh, Calgary, Edmonton, Carleton, and Swan River. Located in the territory of the Cree Indian, Fort Battleford had a stabilizing and encouraging effect in the settlement of the Prairie Provinces, and, during the uprising of 1885, many settlers sought shelter and protection there. It was also the place of execution of those who were sentenced to death for participation in the Frog Lake Massacre.

Visitor attendance at the park rose from 15,214 in the preceding year to 18,099.

SIGNAL HILL NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK covering 243.37 acres, overlooks the entrance to the harbour of St. John's, Newfoundland. On the hill is a memorial tower commemorating Cabot's explorations in North America. There is also a tablet erected on the site, commemorating

the first wireless signal between the North American continent and Europe, which was transmitted by Marconi from a location near the tower. Also within the area in the vicinity of Signal Hill is located the position of the Chain Rock Battery, commanding the narrowest part of the harbour entrance and constructed after the French defeat in 1762; the Waldegrave Battery commanding the Narrows was built in 1810 and constructed on a knoll on the north of Chain Rock. There is also the blockhouse situated on the northern entrance of Signal Hill with six guns mounted on the ground floor, dated 1776; the Duke of York Battery, situated on the southern shoulder of the crest of Signal Hill, which in 1796 mounted eight 24-pounder guns, four 18-pounder carronades, and two 11-inch mortars. A chain of a very large size was fastened to a Chain Rock and lay across the Narrows with its other end fastened to a large capstan on Pancake Rock on the south side of the entrance, by which means it was raised sufficiently to prevent the entrance of any vessels larger than fishing boats.

The Signal Hill area was also the scene of a battle between the British under Colonel William Amherst and the French under Count d'Haussonville in the year when St. John's was finally captured, 1762, since when it has been held under the British Crown.

The powder magazine has been restored and repairs were made to the exterior of the Cabot Tower. A general clean-up of the park area has also been carried out, and an entrance road constructed.

The attendance was approximately 26,307 during the year, an increase of 25,805 over last year.

GRAND PRÉ NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK, at Grand Pré, Nova Scotia, covers 14 acres and includes the property on which stands the Grand Pré Chapel, built by the descendants of the Acadians over a period of eight years and opened as an historic museum in 1930. In its formal lines, planned to reflect mid-eighteenth century French architecture, the chapel preserves the memory of the original church of St. Charles. The museum collection includes maps, portraits, and documentary evidence relating to the Acadians, as well as relics of the first New England settlers in the Minas country.

Ornamental landscaping in the park complements the graceful beauty of Evangeline's Monument, the Memorial Chapel and the interest of "Evangeline's Well" with its wooden well sweep.

Visitors numbered 38,945 during the year, an increase of 7,583 from the previous year.

FORT LANGLEY NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK which is the Fort Langley site of the old Hudson's Bay Company post in B.C., has been taken over by the Federal Government. It occupies an area of 9 acres.

The original fort built in 1827 was completely destroyed by fire in April, 1840. The trading post was rebuilt on a new site, the present village of Fort Langley, some two and one-half miles farther up the Fraser River.

By 1864 the fort was being gradually dismantled. The front and part of the stockade were taken down by degrees between 1861 and 1864, and the remainder was allowed to fall into disrepair. The growth of general farming in the colony caused the Hudson's Bay Company to abandon its fur trading in the Fraser Valley in June of 1896.

An old storehouse, which dates from 1840, is the only original building of the post now standing. Restoration of that building and of others in the fort is underway and construction of the palisades is continuing.

Visitors numbered 55,010 during the year, an increase of 52,510.

FORT PRINCE OF WALES NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK covering an area of 50 acres, opposite the port of Churchill, Manitoba, is the most northerly fortress on the North American continent, and was built in the years between 1733 and 1771 by the Hudson's Bay Company to secure control of Hudson's Bay. In 1782, a French expedition, under La Pérouse captured the fort which was then stripped of all valuable items and demolished to a large extent. The fort, partially restored, stands today in much the same condition as La Pérouse left it.

Attendance registration numbered 425, a decrease of 75 persons from last year.

ALEXANDER GRAHAM BELL MUSEUM, at Baddeck, Nova Scotia was constructed in 1954-55 by the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, to present the scientific research of Dr. Bell through the displays contained therein. This park covers an area of 14 acres.

45,804 visitors registered last year, an increase of 9,751 over the previous year.

QUEBEC WALLS AND FORTIFICATIONS, Quebec.

Repointing and rebuilding the wall was continued.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER'S BIRTHPLACE at St. Lin-des-Laurentides, Quebec, covers an area of 1.5 acres.

Six thousand three hundred and sixty-three (6,363) persons visited the site last year.

BATOCHÉ RECTORY, Batoché, Saskatchewan is a permanent monument to the battle in 1885 between the Métis, under Louis Riel and

Gabriel Dumont, and the forces of General Middleton. On May 12th the Métis, after a brave offensive, were routed and Riel's movement was broken. Riel was captured three days later. The first floor will be used as a museum commemorating the events of 1885, as well as the life and customs of the Métis, the Indians, and the settlers of the district. The second floor will be restored as a school room and a post office, having been used for this purpose during the 1880's.

This site covers 1.5 acres.

Six hundred (600) persons registered as visitors, a decrease from last year of 200.

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY

The Canadian Historical Association joined the other Learned Societies in helping to celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the opening of the University of Saskatchewan by holding the Association's thirty-eighth annual meeting in Saskatoon on June 3-6, 1959. The ninety-three delegates who signed the register were much impressed by the extensive building programme which is making the University campus one of the finest in Western Canada. The Association is very much indebted to the Committee on Arrangements, Conference of Learned Societies, under the chairmanship of Prof. Clarence Tracy. Its admirable arrangements contributed greatly to the success of the meetings. The planning of the programme was capably handled by a committee headed by Dr. Hilda Neatby. Members and their wives enjoyed the hospitality of the University at a reception and dinner tendered by the University of Saskatchewan on 4 June.

The Archives Section and the Local History Section met on the opening day, Wednesday, 3 June, the former being chaired by Mr. William Ormsby, the latter by Professor Margaret Ormsby. Mr. John H. Archer, Legislative Librarian and Archivist of Saskatchewan, addressed the Archives Section on *Saskatchewan's Records Retention and Disposal Programme*. Mr. David Shadd, Public Archives of Canada, spoke later and revealed *Some Problems in providing Reference Service at a Records Centre*.^{*} In the evening, the Council of the Association held its first meeting.

In the Murray Memorial Library, a large number of members of the Association attended the unveiling of a memorial plaque to the late Professor A. S. Morton, first head of the Department of History at the University of Saskatchewan. Prof. G. W. Simpson, who unveiled the plaque, spoke warmly of his former colleague's services to the Saskatchewan community. Prof. W. L. Morton paid a tribute from the Canadian Historical Association, hailing his namesake as "the greatest of our regional historians".

The general sessions began on 4 June. In the Canadian History Section Colonel C. P. Stacey, Director of the Historical Section, Army Headquarters, took a searching look at generals and generalship before Quebec, 1759-1760. The topic was a timely one in view of the observance this year of the Bicentenary of the Battle of the Plains of Abraham. Col. Stacey suggested that although Wolfe and Montcalm both had military talents, neither deserves to rank among the great captains of history.

^{*} These two papers are scheduled for publication early in 1960 in the *Journal of the Society of Archivists*, London, England.

Prof. G. F. G. Stanley, Royal Military College of Canada, led the discussion. Dr. P. Harnetty of the University of British Columbia addressed the English History Section on *British and Indian Attitudes to the Indian Problem at the end of the Nineteenth Century*. He showed how the British determination to retain full control of the Indian Empire, based partly on the ideal of a "sacred trust" to civilize India, conflicted with the political aims of the Congress which sought a greater share in ruling the country and a gradual advance to self-government under the aegis of the British. Dean N. H. Fieldhouse, McGill University led the ensuing discussion. In the afternoon, Prof. Michel Brunet, Université de Montréal, addressed the Canadian History Section on *Le rôle des métropoles et des entrepreneurs dans la colonisation de l'Amérique et la mise en valeur de la vallée du Saint-Laurent*. Prof. Brunet examined the attempt of French colonization to match the work of Great Britain and its investors both at home and in North America in magnificently fulfilling their colonizing responsibilities. He found that the effort made by France and its investors, although considerable, was insufficient. Prof. W. J. Eccles, University of Alberta, was commentator. In the Mediaeval and European History Section there were two papers. Prof. Norman F. Cantor, Princeton University, gave a new interpretation of the age of the Gregorian reform and the investiture controversy. He suggested that the Gregorian revolutionaries, in the period from 1050 to 1130, while destroying the idea of theocratic or quasi-sacred monarchy, failed to substitute the papal supremacy over all the states concerned. Instead they indirectly and unconsciously encouraged the growth of the secular state founded on administrative bureaucracy. Mr. James A. Leith, University of Saskatchewan, discussed the idea of art as a means of propaganda during the French Revolution. Because the new government did not have the funds to commission many works of art with a revolutionary theme, and because the rapidly changing reputations of revolutionary heroes made it difficult to idealize them, and above all, because a belief in artistic freedom safeguarded artists from being forced to depict revolutionary subjects, the idea of using art as propaganda was not so successfully applied in the French Revolution as has been the case with certain modern states. In the evening, in a session devoted to Local History, members and visitors heard an exposition by Prof. Jean E. Murray, University of Saskatchewan, of some aspects of the early history of the University of Saskatchewan. Prof. Murray traced the early development of higher education in that part of the North-West Territories which eventually became Saskatchewan. The commentator was Prof. W. L. Morton of the University of Manitoba.

Prof. L. H. Gipson, Lehigh Institute of Research, was the only speaker on the morning of 5 June. Under the title, *Colonies Ripe for Revolt: The Older British North American Colonies, 1763*, Prof. Gipson summarized the changes that the Seven Years' War had brought to these

colonies. In examining the factors that lead to the war for American independence, Prof. Gipson contended that in view of the degree of self-sufficiency reached by the colonies, no offer of representation in the British Parliament would have been acceptable. Prof. Gipson's conclusion was that the only way to have preserved the old British Empire would have been to have given the colonials a free choice of remaining a part of it or of peacefully separating from it. The afternoon of 5 June was taken up with a meeting of the Council and the general meeting of the Association.

The Council accepted with regret the resignation of Col. C. P. Stacey who had edited the Historical Booklets Series since its inception, and a vote of appreciation was extended to Col. Stacey. The Historical Atlas Committee reported that work on the Atlas was well advanced and that publication was expected early in the spring of 1960. The English Language Secretary reported that a successful Summer Study Centre had been held at Queen's University in 1958 with six members attending. Only three applications had been received for the 1959 Study Centre which was again being held at Queen's University from 6 July to 14 August. Mr. W. G. Ormsby reported that there had been fourteen registrations for the Archives Course being conducted by Carleton University during June.

A joint evening session was held with the Canadian Political Science Association in Convocation Hall under the chairmanship of Dr. J. M. Spinks, President-Elect of the University of Saskatchewan. Dr. S. D. Clark delivered the Presidential Address of the Canadian Political Science Association. The Presidential Address of the Canadian Historical Association had to be cancelled due to the unfortunate absence through illness of Mgr. A. d'Eschambault. In a re-arrangement of the programme the joint session heard a lively panel discussion on the late R. MacGregor Dawson's book *William Lyon Mackenzie King*.† Members of the panel, which was chaired by Dean James A. Gibson of Carleton University, were: Professor F. H. Underhill, Laurier House; Dr. E. A. Forsey, Director of Research, Canadian Labour Congress; and Professor J. R. Mallory of McGill University.

At the General Meeting of the Association, members were told that membership of the Association at the end of May 1959 stood at 840, a net gain of 57 over the previous year. The following officers were elected for 1959-60: President: W. L. Morton, Winnipeg; Vice-President: W. K. Ferguson, London; English Language Secretary: G. W. L. Nicholson, Ottawa; French Language Secretary: Rev. A. Pouliot, s.j., Quebec; Treasurer: R. S. Gordon, Ottawa; Past Presidents: Mgr. A. d'Eschambault, Genthon, Manitoba, and W. Kaye Lamb, Ottawa; Editors of the

† Professor Underhill's views on Dawson's *King* have since appeared in the *Canadian Forum*, August, 1959.

Annual Report : D. T. W. Shadd, Ottawa, and P. E. Dumas, Ottawa; Councillors (to retire in 1962) : D. M. L. Farr, Ottawa, Rev. D. J. Mulvihill, Windsor, J.-C. Bonenfant, Quebec, and Miss Margaret Ormsby, Vancouver; Chairman of the Programme and Local Arrangements Committee for the 1960 Annual Meeting: F. W. Gibson, Kingston. The Association accepted an invitation to hold their 1960 meetings in Kingston, where Queen's University and the Royal Military College of Canada will act as joint hosts.

On Saturday, 6 June, some thirty-five members of the Association enjoyed an Historic Sites Tour to Battleford. The programme, which was arranged by a committee under the chairmanship of Mr. L. H. Thomas of Regina College, included visits to the cairn marking the surrender of Chief Poundmaker, the old North-West Territories' Government House, Fort Battleford and its Indian museum. They also attended the unveiling of a cairn on the site where the *Saskatchewan Herald*, the first newspaper in the North-West Territories, began publication in 1878. In bringing greetings from the Canadian Historical Association, the English Language Secretary, Col. G. W. L. Nicholson, drew attention to a resolution adopted by the Association regarding its gratification at the continued interest of the Government of Saskatchewan in preserving and marking the Province's historic sites. During the course of the tour members of the Association were the guests of the Town of Battleford at a luncheon in the Windsor Hotel.

Ottawa, August, 1959

G. W. L. NICHOLSON,
English Language Secretary.

REPORT OF LOCAL HISTORY SECTION

During the course of the year the terms of the proposed annual awards of merit, as amended at the business meeting in 1958, were circulated to all members of the Section. At the same time, the members of the Section were requested to send circulars to provincial historical societies and local history societies inviting them to make the first nominations for awards early in 1960. The order for the printing of the certificates was given to Robert R. Reid of Vancouver.

In order to spread information concerning developments in the local history field, the Section circulated to presidents of provincial historical societies a comprehensive report on progress in Ontario and requested that this report be used as a model for the preparation of other provincial reports. Reports on activities in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick which have now been received will be circulated to the other provincial societies.

At its business meeting on June 3, 1959, the Section returned its present slate of officers: Chairman, Margaret A. Ormsby; Vice-Chairman, Professor Maurice Careless; 2nd Vice-Chairman, Professor G. F. G. Stanley; English-Language Secretary, Professor Morris Zaslow; French-Language Secretary, Fr. Adrien Pouliot.

The Section also took steps to improve the machinery for the making of nominations for awards, choosing for the purpose a special chairman in each province.

To facilitate the collection of the \$1 fee which Council gave the Section the power to impose on affiliated local history societies at the meeting in June, 1958, the members decided to request permission from Council to have the Treasurer of the Association collect the sum on its behalf.

Saskatoon, June, 1959.

MARGARET A. ORMSBY,
Chairman.

REPORT OF ARCHIVES SECTION

The annual meeting of the Archives Section of the Canadian Historical Association was held on June 3 in the Saskatchewan Archives Office, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon. During the morning business session, reports on accessions and activities were presented by the Nova Scotia Archives, the Saskatchewan Archives, the Glenbow Foundation, and the Public Archives of Canada.

A committee was established to collect information on the holdings, publications and history of archival depositories in Canada, and also to prepare a checklist of political papers in such depositories. The committee will prepare a questionnaire and send it to the various institutions holding records and manuscripts. It is hoped that the successful completion of this project will prepare the way for a start on a union catalogue of manuscripts in Canada.

During the business meeting the following officers were elected for the coming year: Chairman, H. Bowesfield; Vice-Chairman, C. B. Fergusson; Secretary, Evelyn Eager.

The afternoon was devoted to the presentation of papers and discussion followed by a tour of the Saskatoon Section of the Saskatchewan Archives. John Archer, Legislative Librarian and Archivist of Saskatchewan read a paper on "Saskatchewan's Records Retention and Disposal Programme", and David Shadd of the Public Archives of Canada discussed "Some Problems in Providing Reference Service at a Records Centre".

For several years a primary objective of the Archives Section has been the establishment of an archivists' training course with special emphasis on the Canadian archival situation. During the past summer this objective was attained when Carleton University, with the co-operation of the Public Archives of Canada, presented a course of four weeks duration. Candidates were registered from all parts of Canada from Newfoundland to British Columbia, and of the thirteen who wrote the examination at the end of the course eleven were successful.

Saskatoon, June, 1959.

EVELYN EAGER,
Secretary.

REPORT OF TREASURER - RAPPORT DU TRÉSORIER

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS FOR PERIOD JANUARY 1, 1958 — FEBRUARY 28, 1959

CURRENT ACCOUNT

RECEIPTS

Cash in Bank, January 1, 1958		\$2,448.48
Bank Interest	43.67	
Membership Fees	6,293.87	
Sale of Annual Reports	253.50	
Printing of Historic Sites and Monuments Board Reports : 1957 and 1958	151.06	6,742.10
		<u>\$9,190.58</u>

DISBURSEMENTS

Audit Fee	15.00	
Bank Exchange	62.49	
Discount on U.S. funds	29.03	
Remittance for members' subscriptions :		
Canadian Historical Review	2,283.16	
Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science including joint membership in CPSA	967.50	
Review d'Histoire de l'Amérique française	209.25	
Printing Annual Reports :		
Report 1957	1,009.78	
Report 1958	1,225.00	2,234.78
Printing Annual Meeting Programme		93.50
Administration :		
Clerical Assistance	165.00	
Stationery	261.79	
Addressograph - Multigraph	29.13	
Petty Cash : Postage	248.23	
Sundries	95.67	799.82
		6,694.53
Cash on hand and in Bank, February 28, 1959 -	3,463.55	
Less Outstanding Cheque	967.50	2,496.05
		<u>\$9,190.58</u>

TRAVELLING ACCOUNT

RECEIPTS

Balance in Bank, January 1, 1958	289.74
Bank Interest	9.46
Travelling Grants	1,880.00
	<u>\$2,179.20</u>

DISBURSEMENTS

Grants to Members to attend Annual Meeting ..	1,342.70
Balance in Bank, February 28, 1959	836.50
	<u>\$2,179.20</u>

RESERVE ACCOUNT

Balance, January 1, 1958 :		
Cash in Bank	2,495.66	
Dominion of Canada Bonds		
\$1,500 - 3¼% due 1979 at cost	1,500.00	3,995.66
Receipts :		
Bank Interest	40.72	
Bond Interest	48.74	89.46
Sale of Booklets		747.40
Grant from Quebec Provincial Secretary ..		250.00
Life Memberships		295.15
		<u>\$5,377.67</u>
Disbursements :		
Printing Booklet No. 9		331.65
Summer Study Centre		100.00
Bank Exchange		5.05
Discount on U.S. funds		0.87
Cash in Bank, February 28, 1959	1,947.91	
Government of Canada Bonds		
\$1,500 - 3¼% due 1979 at cost	1,500.00	
Ontario Hydro Electric Bonds		
\$1,500 - 5% due 1978 at cost	1,485.00	
Accrued interest to date of purchase	7.19	4,940.10
		<u>\$5,377.67</u>

Examined with the books and vouchers
and found correct.

(sgd.) CHARLES W. PEARCE
Certified Public Accountant

ROBERT S. GORDON
Treasurer.

Ottawa, March 12, 1959.

Note : At the autumn meeting of the Council a recommendation of the Treasurer was approved that the Association's fiscal year should be altered to end on the last day of February. Consequently this report is for a fourteen-month period.

PERSONAL NOTES PERSONNELLES

M. Guy Frégault, Directeur de l'Institut d'Histoire et vice-doyen de la Faculté des Lettres, à l'Université de Montréal, devient Directeur du Centre de Recherches historiques à l'Université d'Ottawa.

M. Léopold Lamontagne, Directeur de l'Ecole de langues modernes au Collège militaire royal du Canada à Kingston, quitte le Collège et l'Armée.

M. Paul-E. Dumas, chef adjoint de la Cartothèque aux Archives publiques du Canada, est élu éditeur français à la Société Historique du Canada, en remplacement de M. Léopold Lamontagne.

Nouveau séjour de M. Gustave Lanctôt en Europe pour fins de recherches historiques.

M. Jean Bruchési, sous-secrétaire de la Province de Québec, est nommé ambassadeur du Canada en Espagne.

M. Jacques Gouin, traducteur à la Chambre des Communes, publie par tranches hebdomadaires, dans *Le Droit* d'Ottawa, une *Histoire de la Deuxième Guerre Mondiale 1935-1945*.

Le major général Georges Vanier, ancien ambassadeur du Canada à Paris et fondateur du 22^e Régiment durant le premier conflit mondial, succède au T. H. Vincent Massey comme Gouverneur Général du Canada. Monsieur Massey fut Président Honoraire de la Société Historique du Canada de 1953 à 1959.

La Société Saint-Jean-Baptiste de la ville de Québec participa officiellement à la commémoration du 200^e anniversaire de la Bataille des Plaines d'Abraham (13 septembre 1759). Le thème de cette commémoration fut: "Deux cents ans d'association progressive".

Mr. John P. Heisler has kindly contributed the English notes which follow: Dr. C. P. Stacey, former Head of the Army Historical Section, has joined the History Department, University of Toronto, and has been succeeded in the Army Historical Section by Col. G. W. L. Nicholson. Professor D. G. G. Kerr, formerly of Mount Allison University, has joined the History Department, University of Western Ontario. Professor K. W. McNaught, formerly of United College, Winnipeg, is now with the History Department of the University of Toronto. Professor Peter Waite of Dalhousie University is on sabbatical leave in Great Britain. Dr. J. H. S. Reid, formerly of United College, Winnipeg, has become the first permanent Secretary of the Canadian Association of University Teachers. Recent additions to the staff of the Public Archives of Canada include Mr. Thomas Matheson and Mr. Robert Todd. Mr. A. M. Willms of the Public Archives Records Centre is on leave of absence to lecture on Public

Administration at Carleton University during the academic year 1959-60. In his absence Mr. David Shadd and Mr. William Bilsland will serve successively as Acting Head of the Centre. The following persons recently have become life members of the Canadian Historical Association: Mr. J. G. McEachern, Mr. Bernard Ostry, Rev. F. G. Peake, Mr. L. C. Tombs and Dr. George E. Wilson.

MEMBERSHIP OF THE CANADIAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

(A) AFFILIATED SOCIETIES — SOCIÉTÉS AFFILIÉES

- American Antiquarian Society*, Salisbury St. & Park Ave., Worcester 5, Mass.
American Geographical Society, Broadway at 156th St., New York 32.
Antiquarian & Numismatic Society of Montreal, Chateau de Ramezay, Montreal.
British Columbia Historical Ass'n, Provincial Archives, Victoria, B.C.
British Columbia Historical Ass'n, Victoria Section, c/o J. K. Nesbitt, Chairman, Victoria, B.C.
British Columbia Historical Ass'n, West Kootenay Section, c/o Mrs. A. D. Turnbull, 300 Kootenay Ave., Trail, B.C.
Canadian Church Historical Society, Rev. Canon A. R. Kelley, 4127 Wilson Ave., Montreal.
Essex County Historical Ass'n, c/o N. F. Morrison, President, 1112 Chilver Rd., Windsor, Ont.
Finnish Canadian Historical Society, Rev. L. T. Pikkusaari, Chairman, Copper Cliff, Ont.
Lachine Society of Regional History, c/o R. H. Ford, President, 125-53rd Ave., Lachine, P.Q.
Lake St. Louis Historical Society, 164 Lakeshore Rd., Pointe Claire, P.Q.
Lennox & Addington Historical Society, Miss L. A. Woods, Sec.-Treas., Napanee, Ont.
MacNab Historical Ass'n, Miss Hilda Ridley, Sec., Foleyet, Ont.
Minnesota Historical Society, St. Paul 1, Minn.
Nova Scotia Historical Society, H. R. Banks, Treas. 334 South St., Halifax, N.S.
The Ontario Historical Society, 27 Surrey Place, Toronto 5.
Quebec Literary & Historical Society, Box 399, Quebec.
Royal Empire Society, Northumberland Ave., London, England.
Saanich Pioneer's Society, Mrs. W. Bethell, 2859 Prior St., Victoria, B.C.
Sask. History and Folklore Ass'n, Mrs. Muriel J. Clipshaw, Sec., 2658 Angus Blvd., Regina.
La Société Historique de la Côte du Sud, Collège de Sainte-Anne, Kamouraska, P.Q.
La Société Historique Franco-Américaine, M. l'abbé Adrien Verette, président, Suncook, N.H.
La Société Historique du Nouvel-Ontario, c/o Rév. Lorenzo Cadieux, Université de Sudbury, Sudbury, Ont.
La Société Historique de Québec, M. l'abbé Provost, secrétaire, Université Laval, Québec.
La Société Historique du Saguenay, Séminaire de Chicoutimi, Chicoutimi, P.Q.
La Société Saint-Jean-Baptiste, Georges Meyers, secrétaire, C.P. 186, Trois-Rivières, P.Q.
Thunder Bay Historical Society, Mrs. Jessie Dale, Sec., Public Library Bldg., Fort William, Ont.
Toronto Civic Historical Committee, Old Fort York, Toronto 2B.
Wisconsin State Historical Society, C. L. Lord, Director, 816 State St., Madison 6, Wis.
Wolverine Hobby & Historical Society, A. M. Provick, Sec.-Treas., Hazelcliffe, Sask.
Women's Wentworth Historical Society, c/o Mrs. J. D. Campbell, 16 Inglewood Dr., Hamilton.
York Pioneer & Historical Society, A. G. Clarry, Pres., 37 Elmsthorpe Rd., Toronto 7.

(B) AFFILIATED LIBRARIES AND ORGANIZATIONS
BIBLIOTHÈQUES ET AUTRES ORGANISATIONS AFFILIÉES

- Acadia University Library*, Wolfville, N.S.
Alberta Provincial Library, Parliament Bldgs., Edmonton, Alta.
Argosy Book Stores Inc., 116 East 59th St., New York 22.
Assumption University, The Library, Windsor, Ont.
Auckland University College, The Librarian, P.O. Box 2553, Auckland, N.Z.
Bank of Canada, Research Dept., Ottawa.
Bank of Nova Scotia Library, Dept. of Economics, Toronto.
Brondon College Library, Brandon, Man.
British Columbia Provincial Archives, Victoria.
Brown University Library, Providence 12, R.I.
Calgary Public Library, Calgary.
Campion College Library, Regina.
Canadian Temperance Federation, 11 Prince Arthur Ave., Toronto 5.
Carleton University Library, Ottawa.
Clark University Library, 1 Downing St., Worcester 10, Mass.
Clarke, Irwin & Co. Ltd., 791 St. Clair Ave. W., Toronto 10.
Cleveland Public Library, 325 Superior Ave. N.E., Cleveland 14, Ohio.
Collège Jean-de-Brébeuf, 3200 Chemin Sainte-Catherine, Montréal 26.
Collège de Lévis, La Bibliothèque, Lévis, P.Q.
Collège de Montréal, 1931 rue Sherbrooke ouest, Montréal.
Collège de Sainte-Anne-de-la-Pocatière, Sainte-Anne-de-la-Pocatière, P.Q.
Collège de Sainte-Marie, Les Archives, 1180 rue Bleury, Montréal 2.
Columbia University Libraries, 535 West 114th St., New York 27.
Cornwall Collegiate & Vocational School, Cornwall.
Dalhousie University Library, Halifax.
Dartmouth College Library, Hanover, N.H.
Detroit Historical Museum, Dept. of Social History, Detroit 2.
Duke University Library, Durham, N.C.
Dept. of External Affairs Library, East Block, Ottawa.
Fraser-Hickson Institute, 3485 McTavish St., Montréal 2.
Glenbow Foundation, 1202-6th St. S.W., Calgary.
Hamilton Public Library, Hamilton.
Harvard College Library, Cambridge 38, Mass.
Haverford College Library, Haverford, Pa.
Huntington Library & Art Gallery, Zone 15, San Marino, Calif.
Huron College, R.R. 3, London, Ont.
Indiana State Library, 140 N. Senate Ave., Zone 4, Indianapolis, Ind.
John Hopkins University Library, Baltimore 18, Md.
King's College Library, Strand, London W.C. 2, England.
R. H. King Collegiate School, 3800 St. Clair Ave. E., Toronto 13.
Leaside Public Library, 165 McRae Dr., Leaside, Ont.
Library of Parliament, Ottawa.
London Public Library, London, Ont.
Loyola College Library, 7141 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal.
McCord Museum, McGill University, Montreal.
McGill University Library, 3459 McTavish St., Montreal.
McMaster University Library, Hamilton, Ont.
La Maison Bellarmin, 25 rue Jarry ouest, Montréal 14.
La Maison Provinciale des Clercs de Saint-Viateur, 1145 ave Saint-Viateur, Outremont, P.Q.
La Maison Saint-Joseph, Bibliothèque, 1800 est, Boul. Henri-Bourassa, Montréal 12.
Manitoba Provincial Library, Winnipeg.
Memorial University of Newfoundland, St. John's, Nfld.

- Michigan State University*, The Library, East Lansing, Mich.
Midland Public Library, 224 Hugel Ave. W., Midland, Ont.
Montana State College Library, Bozeman, Mont.
Mount Allison University, Memorial Library, Sackville, N.B.
National Conference of Canadian Universities, 77 Metcalfe St., Ottawa 4.
National Film Board, 3255 Cote de Liesse Rd., Ville St Laurent, P.Q.
National Liberal Federation of Canada, 251 Cooper St., Ottawa.
National Museum, Bureau of Geology and Topography, Ottawa.
National Parks Branch, The Director, Rm. 715, Norlite Bldg., Ottawa.
New Brunswick Legislative Library, Fredericton, N.B.
New York Public Library, Fifth Ave., & 42nd St., New York 18, N.Y.
New York State Library, Albany 1, N.Y.
North Central Saskatchewan Regional Library, Prince Albert, Sask.
North Toronto Collegiate, 17 Broadway Ave., Toronto.
North York Public Library, 5090 Yonge St., Willowdale, Ont.
Oak Bay Senior High School, 2151 Cranmore Ave., Victoria, B.C.
Ontario Dept. of Education, Secondary Education Branch, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto.
Ontario Dept. of Planning & Development, Conservation Branch Library, 454 University Ave., Toronto.
Ontario Dept. of Public Records and Archives, 14 Queen's Park Cres. W., Toronto 5.
Ontario Dept. of Travel & Publicity, Historical Branch, 67 College St., Toronto.
Ontario Legislative Library, Parliament Bldgs., Toronto 2.
Ottawa Public Library, Metcalfe St., Ottawa.
Penticton Jr-Sr High School, 158 Eckhardt Ave., E., Penticton, B.C.
Peterborough Public Library, Peterborough, Ont.
Petit Séminaire de Chicoutimi, La Bibliothèque, rue Jacques-Cartier est, Chicoutimi, P.Q.
Pickering District High School, Pickering, Ont.
Port Credit Secondary School, 40 Forest Ave., Port Credit, Ont.
Prince of Wales College, The Library, Charlottetown, P.E.I.
Princeton University Library, Princeton, N.J.
Public Library Commission, North Central District, 1480 Third Ave., Prince George, B.C.
Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa.
Archives de la Province de Québec, La Bibliothèque, Parc des Champs de Bataille, Québec.
Quebec Legislative Library, Parliament Bldgs., Québec.
Québec Ministère des Terres et Forêts, Hôtel du Gouvernement, Québec.
Queen's University Library, Kingston, Ont.
Regina College Library, University of Saskatchewan, Regina.
Rhodes House Library, The Keeper, Oxford, England.
Royal Bank of Canada, The Library, Head Office, Montreal.
Royal Military College, The Commandant, Kingston, Ont.
St. Catharines Public Library, St. Catharines, Ont.
St. Francis Xavier University Library, Antigonish, N.S.
Saint John Free Public Library, Saint John, N.B.
St. Patrick's College Library, 281 Echo Dr., Ottawa 1.
Sarnia Collegiate Institute, Sarnia, Ont.
Saskatchewan Legislative Library, R. 234 Legislative Bldg., Regina.
Saskatchewan Provincial Library, Administration Bldg., Regina.
Sault Ste Marie Public Library, Queen St. E., Sault Ste Marie, Ont.
School District No. 54, Smithers, B.C.
Séminaire de Québec, M. l'Archiviste, Université Laval, Québec.
Séminaire de St-Hyacinthe, Bibliothèque, case postale 577, St-Hyacinthe, P.Q.
Séminaire de Saint-Joseph, Bibliothèque, Mont-Laurier, Comté de Labelle, P.Q.

- Séminaire Sainte-Marie*, Shawinigan Falls, P.Q.
Séminaire de Sainte-Thérèse, Bibliothèque, Sainte-Thérèse de Blainville, P.Q.
Sigmund Samuel Canadiana Library, Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto 5.
State University of Iowa, University Libraries, Iowa City, Iowa.
Sudbury High School Board, Sudbury, Ont.
Sudbury Mining & Technical School, c/o J. R. Campbell, Sudbury, Ont.
Temple University Library, Philadelphia 22, Pa.
Toronto Public Library, College & St. George Sts., Toronto 2B.
United Church of Canada Archives, Victoria University, Queen's Park, Toronto 5.
Université de Montréal, Montréal.
Université de Saint-Joseph, La Bibliothèque, Saint-Joseph, N.B.
University of Alberta Library, Edmonton.
University of British Columbia Library, Vancouver 8.
University of California Library, 405 Hilgard Ave., West Los Angeles, Calif.
University of California Library, Berkeley 4, Calif.
University of Cincinnati Library, Campus Station, Cincinnati 21, Ohio.
University of Delaware, Memorial Library, Newark, Del.
University of Illinois Library, Urbana, Ill.
University of London, Institute of Historical Research, Senate House, London W. C. 1, England.
University of Madrid, Madrid, Spain.
University of Manitoba Library, Winnipeg.
University of Michigan General Library, Ann Arbor, Mich.
University of New Brunswick Library, Fredericton, N.B.
University of Oregon Library, Eugene, Oregon.
University of Queensland Library, St. Lucia, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.
University of Rochester, Rush Rhees Library, Rochester 20, N.Y.
University of Saskatchewan Library, Saskatoon.
University of Sydney, Fisher Library, Sydney, Australia.
University of Toronto Library, Toronto 5.
University of Washington Library, Seattle 5, Wash.
University of Western Ontario Library, London, Ont.
Vancouver Public Library, Vancouver, B.C.
Victoria College Library, 3155 Richmond Rd., Victoria.
Victoria University Library, Charles St. & Queen's Park, Toronto 5.
Washington State University Library, Pullman, Wash.
Wayne University Library, 456 Merrick Ave., Detroit 2, Mich.
Webster Canadian Library, New Brunswick Museum, Saint John, N.B.
Wellesley College Library, Wellesley 81, Mass.
Western Branch Library, 955 Main St. W., Hamilton, Ont.
Westmount Public Library, 4574 Sherbrooke St. W., Westmount 6, P.Q.
Windsor Public Library, 434 Victoria Ave., Windsor, Ont.
Winnipeg Public Library, Winnipeg.
Yale University Library, New Haven, Conn.
Zeitungsvertriebsamt, Clara-Zetkin St. 62, Berlin N. W. 7, Germany.

(C) LIFE MEMBERS — MEMBRES A VIE

In lists following, asterisk (*) indicates a former *President of the Association*.

- Barr, R. B. F., 43 Admiral Rd., Toronto 5.
 Bell, Winthrop, Chester, N.S.
 * **Brown, G. W.**, **University of Toronto, Toronto 5.**
 * **Burt, A. L.**, **1539 East River Terrace, Minneapolis 14, Minn.**
 Burton, C. L. 136 Glen Rd., Toronto.
 Canada Packers Ltd., 2200 St. Clair Ave. W., Toronto 9.

- Chartier, Mgr Emile (P.D.), 605 rue Villeneuve, Sherbrooke E., P.Q.
 Davidson, Edgar, 32 Thurlow Rd., Hampstead, Montreal.
 Fee, Norman, 712 Echo Dr., Ottawa.
 Glazebrook, G. de T., Dept. of External Affairs, East Block, Ottawa.
 Graham, G. S., King's College, Strand, London W.C.2., England.
 Hardy, Mrs. A. C., Brockville, Ont.
 Helstrom, C. T. E., Box 27, Gray, Sask.
 Hudson's Bay Company, Canadian Committee Office, Winnipeg.
 * **Lanctot, Gustave, 154 Daly Ave., Ottawa.**
 * **Landon, Fred, 846 Helmuth Ave., London, Ont.**
 * **Long, M. H., 11615 Saskatchewan Dr., Edmonton.**
 * **Lower, A. R. M., Queen's University, Kingston, Ont.**
 McEachern, J. G., 205 Victoria St., London, Ont.
 Mackenzie, D. R., 339 Island Park Dr., Ottawa.
 Mathews, Mrs. H. C., 10 King St., Oakville, Ont.
 Moir, J. S., Carleton University, Ottawa.
 Moore, Miss K. V., 157 Harris Ave., London, Ont.
 Morgan, C. F., Morgan Trust Co., 1455 Union Ave., Montreal.
 Myers, L. P., 89 Durie St., Toronto 3.
 Peake, Rev. F. A., Director Religious Education, Christ Church Rectory, Glanworth, Ont.
 Raymond, Hon. D., The Senate, Ottawa.
 * **Sage, W. N., 4687 — W. 4th Ave., Vancouver 8.**
 Saunders, R. M., Flavell House, University of Toronto, Toronto 5.
 Sifton, Victor, Winnipeg Free Press, Winnipeg.
 * **Soward, F. H., University of British Columbia, Vancouver 8.**
 * **Stacey, Col. C. P., 874 Avenue Rd., Toronto 7.**
 Tombs, Guy, 1085 Beaver Hall Hill, Montreal 1.
 Tombs, L. C., 1085 Beaver Hall Hill, Montreal 1.
 Tweed, T. W., Elm Grove Farm, R.R. 1, Palgrave, Ont.
 * **Underhill, F. H., Laurier House, Ottawa.**
 Wilson, Hon. Cairine N., The Senate, Ottawa.
 * **Wilson, G. E., Dalhousie University, Halifax.**
 Wright, Mrs. E. C., 407 Island Park Dr., Ottawa.

(D) ANNUAL MEMBERS — MEMBRES A L'ANNÉE

C. denotes *College*; U. denotes *University*.

- | | |
|--|--|
| Abraham, W. P., 9 Cathedral St., St. John's, Nfld. | Archer, John H., 3078 Montague St., Regina. |
| * Adair, E. R., 312B West 34th St., Austin, Tex. | Arkin, N., 269 Fort St., Winnipeg. |
| Adams, E. G., Suite 203, 95 King St. E., Toronto 1. | Arthur, Miss M. E., 1726 Victoria Ave., Apt. 3, Fort William, Ont. |
| Ainsworth, T. H., City Museum, 401 Main St., Vancouver 4. | Aubrey, Roger, 415 Pius XII, Aut. 7, Eastview, Ont. |
| Aitchison, J. H., Dalhousie U., Halifax. | Avakumovic, Ivan, Dept. of Pol. Sc., U. of Manitoba, Winnipeg. |
| Alcock, F. J., 398 Third Ave., Ottawa. | Badanai, Hubert, M.P., 1717 McGregor Ave., Fort William, Ont. |
| Alexson, Mrs. F. M., 3220 Albert St. Regina. | Bailey, Alfred, U. of New Brunswick, Fredericton, N.B. |
| Amtmann, Bernard, 750 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal. | Ballantyne, M. G., 470 St. Alexis St., Montreal 1. |
| Anderson, Mrs. J. R., 371 Claremont Ave., Westmount, P.Q. | Banks, Miss M. A., 125 Clyde Ave., Toronto 12. |
| Anderson, Brig. W. A. B., Vice Adj. General, Army Hdqs., Ottawa. | |

- Baudry, Rév. Père René, c.s.c., 58, rue N.-D.-des-Champs, Paris (6^e), France.
- Baudry, Ubalde, 38, rue des Patriotes, Sainte-Rose, (Laval), P.Q.
- Beaumont, Miss Betty, Rm. 202, 2625 Lonsdale Ave., North Vancouver.
- Beck, J. M., Lunenburg, N.S.
- Bélanger, Noël, ptre, 47, rue des Remparts, Québec 4.
- Belisle, Mrs. P. E., Box 520, Buckingham, P.Q.
- Bell, R. A., (Q.C.), M.P., R.R. 1, Britannia Heights, Ont.
- Benson, Miss L. R., The Library, U. of Western Ontario, London, Ont.
- Best, H. B. M., 190 Bronson Ave., Ottawa.
- Bettson, G. E., 27 Urbandale Ave., Willowdale, Ont.
- Bilsland, W. W., Public Archives, Ottawa.
- Bird, W. R., Box 503, Halifax.
- Black, R. C. (III), Dept. of History, Trinity C., Hartford 6, Conn.
- Blackley, F. D., U. of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Blakeley, Miss P. R., Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax.
- Blakney, Mrs. M. M., 17 Lyall St., Ottawa 5.
- Bocking, D. H., 2226 Cumberland Ave. S., Saskatoon.
- Bois, H. C., St.-Bruno, Chambly, P.Q.
- Boland, Rev. F., Assumption U. of Windsor, 400 Huron Line, Windsor, Ont.
- Bolger, Rev. F. W. P., St. Dunstan's U., Charlottetown, P.E.I.
- Bonar, J. C., 599 Lansdowne Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
- Bond, Maj. C.C.J., Historical Section, Army Headquarters, Ottawa.
- Bonenfant, Jean-Charles, Bibliothèque du Parlement, Québec.
- Boudreau, J. A., 3220 Cheviot Vista Place, Los Angeles 34, Calif.
- Boulianne, Réal, 812 Longham Court, Victoria, B.C.
- Bourque, Mlle Juliette, Archives publiques, Ottawa.
- Bousquet, Denis, Faculté d'Histoire, U. d'Ottawa, Ottawa.
- Boutilier, Miss H. R., Suite 106, 3416 Oak St., Vancouver 9.
- Boutilier, Theodore, 183 Plummer Ave., New Waterford, N.S.
- Bowsfield, Hartwell, Provincial Archivist, Provincial Library, Winnipeg 1.
- Boyce, G. E., 174 Albert St., Belleville, Ont.
- Brady, Alexander, 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto 5.
- Bragdon, Chandler, 11 Pleasant St., Plattsburg, N.Y.
- Branscombe, F. R., 108-A Pricefield Rd., Toronto 5.
- Brault, Lucien, Archives publiques, Ottawa 2.
- Brekke, E., 919 — 2nd St. N., Fargo, N.D.
- Britnell, G. E., Dept. of Econ. & Pol. Sc., U. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.
- Brown, P. L., 327 5th Ave., Ottawa.
- Brown, Robert C., 20 Washington St., Livonia, N.Y.
- Bruce, Gordon, 3 Hartington Place, Ottawa.
- * **Bruchési, S. E. Jean, Ambassade du Canada, Calle de Zurbano, 36, Madrid, Espagne.**
- Brunet, Michel, Faculté des Lettres, U. de Montréal, Montréal.
- Brunet, Pierre, Archives publiques, Ottawa.
- Brunsdon, E. W., M.P., Rm. 616, House of Commons, Ottawa.
- Buckmaster, Miss Hilda, United Church Training School, 77 Charles St. W., Toronto 5.
- Burford, W. T., Canadian Federation of Labour, 78 Bank St., Ottawa.
- Burgess, Miss L. M., 67 Grove Ave., Ottawa.
- Burnet, Miss Jean, 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto 5.
- Buxton, George, 2063 Knightsbridge Rd., Ottawa 3.
- Cabana, Mgr Georges, Archevêque de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, P.Q.
- Cairns, J. C., Dept of History, U. of Toronto, Toronto 5.
- Cantor, N. F., Dept. of History, Princeton U. Princeton, N.J.
- Cappadocia, Ezio, Royal Military C., Kingston, Ont.
- Careless, J. M. S., Dept. of History, U. of Toronto, Toronto 5.
- Carter, Miss G. M., Dept. of Government, Smith C., Northampton, Mass.
- Carty, B., 160 Waverley St., Ottawa.
- Caty, J. J., Ross Mines, Holtyre, Ont.
- Celovsky, Boris, R.R. 5, Box 339, Ottawa.
- Chapman, J. K., U. of New Brunswick, Fredericton, N.B.

- Charlebois, Conrad, 138, rue Maison-neuve, Hull, P.Q.
- Cherihue, O. R., 701 Commerce Bldg., 640 W. Hastings St., Vancouver 2.
- Choate, Miss B. P., 5484 Gilpin St., Burnaby 2, B.C.
- Chown, Gordon, M.P., 299 Yale Ave., Winnipeg 9.
- Church, H. B., Orangeville, Ont.
- Ciasnocha, B. E., 2721 Lakeview Ave., Regina.
- Clark, G. H., New Toronto Secondary School, 18th St., New Toronto, Ont.
- Clark, L. C., Dept. of History, U. of New Brunswick, Fredericton, N.B.
- Clarke, N. D., 62 Ross St., Barrie, Ont.
- Coats, R. H., 572 Manor Ave., Rockcliffe, Ottawa.
- Cohen, Maxwell, 1020 Pine Ave. W., Montreal.
- Collins, R. W., 11124 — 84th Ave., Edmonton.
- Comeau, Roger, Archives publiques, Ottawa.
- Conacher, J. B., Dept. of History, U. of Toronto, Toronto 5.
- Condon, Miss C. A., 70 College Ave., Ottawa.
- Conway, J. S., Dept. of History, U. of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Cook, G. R., Dept. of History, U. of Toronto, Toronto 5.
- Cooke, A. C., U. of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Cooper, J. I., McGill University, Montreal.
- Cooper, Stephen, P.O. Box 252, U. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 4, Pa.
- Cornell, P. G., Acadia U., Wolfville, N.S.
- Cornett, Miss E. M., 51 Lake Shore Rd., Mimico, Ont.
- Coryell, Mrs. W. R., Leskard, Ont.
- Cossette, Rev. Joseph, s.j., C. Saint-Ignace, 2919 rue de Bellechasse, Montréal 36.
- Couse, G. S., Dept. of History, Carleton U., Ottawa.
- Coutts, G. B., 2420 Fifth St. S. W., Calgary.
- Coverdale, Miss D., History Dept., Senior Collegiate Inst., Elysian St., St. Thomas, Ont.
- Cowin, J. E., Box 568, Haney, B.C.
- Coyne, J. E., Bank of Canada, Ottawa.
- Craig, G. M., Dept. of History, U. of Toronto, Toronto 5.
- Crean, J. G., 18 Balmuto St., Toronto.
- * **Creighton, D. G., Dept. of History, U. of Toronto, Toronto 5.**
- Croteau, Lionel, Archives publiques, Ottawa.
- Crowe, H. S., Can. Bro. of Rly Employees, 230 Laurier W., Ottawa.
- Cruickshank, Miss J. S., Public Archives, Ottawa.
- Crunican, Rev. Paul, Christ the King C., London, Ont.
- Cumming, Miss Mary, 9 Tennis Cres., Apt. A15., Toronto 6.
- Currie, A. W., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto.
- Currie, R. G. S., 2308 Sandhurst Ave., Calgary.
- Cutbill, Lt. Col. E. W., U.N. Truce Supervision Organization, New York, N.Y.
- Daly, G. M., Iroquois Falls High School, Iroquois Falls, Ont.
- Dandurand, Rév. Marcel, Séminaire, Valleyfield, P.Q.
- Davies, G. O. B., U. of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Davis, Harold A., 29 Kingsbury Ave., Bradford, Mass.
- Davies, R. A., 3468 Melrose Ave., Montreal.
- Delisle, Georges, Archives publiques, Ottawa.
- Demers, M. l'abbé J.-U., 3605 rue de la Montagne, Montréal.
- * **D'Eschambault, M^{re} Antoine, Presbytère Saint-Emile, Genthon, Man.**
- Deshaies, Bruno, 7230, rue Musset, Ville-Saint-Michel, Montréal.
- Deutsch, J. J., Dept. of Econ. & Pol. Sc., U. of British Columbia, Vancouver 8.
- DeVolpi, C. P., 109 Sunnyside Ave., Westmount, P.Q.
- Dexter, Grant, 170 Acadia Ave., Rockcliffe, Ottawa.
- Dick, T. J. O., 24 Farnham Cres., Ottawa 2.
- Dobbin, R. L., 295 Reid St., Peterborough, Ont.
- Dobie, Miss Edith, U. of Washington, Seattle 5, Wash.
- Dodson, Miss Edna, 3325 W., 34th St., Vancouver 13.
- Douglas, H. T., 212 Rideau Terrace, Ottawa.
- Draper, H. L., Box 6, Haney, B.C.
- Drey, Walter Inc., 257 Fourth Ave., New York 10, N.Y.

- Drouin, Gabriel, Institut Généalogique
Drouin, 4184 rue St-Denis, Montréal.
- Drysdale, J. A. W., M.P., Rm. 431,
House of Commons, Ottawa.
- Duff, L. B., 18 King St., Welland, Ont.
- Dumas, P. E., Archives publiques, Ottawa.
- Eager, Miss Evelyn, 14 Parklane Apts.,
613 — 25th St. E., Saskatoon.
- Easterbrook, W. T., 273 Bloor St. W.,
Toronto.
- Eastman, S. Mack, 203 "The Prince
Charles", 2776 Pine St., Vancouver 9.
- Eayrs, James, Dept. of Pol. Econ., 273
Bloor St. W., Toronto 5.
- Eccles, W. J., U. of Alberta., Edmonton.
- Edwards, W. A., 4384 Sherbrooke St. W.,
Apt. 3, Westmount, P.Q.
- Eudes, Raymond, M.P., 1845 Prefon-
taine, Montréal.
- Fairclough, Hon. Ellen L., M.P., Minister
of Citizenship & Immigration, Ottawa.
- Fairley, Mrs. M. A., 90 Willcocks St.,
Toronto.
- Fallis, L. S. Jr., 6011 Pontiac Trail,
Wixom, Mich.
- Farmer, J. D., R.R. 5, Cobourg, Ont.
- Farnham, W. D., Dept. of History, U. of
Alberta, Edmonton.
- Farr, D. M. L., Carleton U., Ottawa.
- Faucher, Albert, U. Laval, Québec.
- Faulkner, P. L., 903 W. Taylor St.,
Kokomo, Indiana.
- Ferguson, P. B. G., 641 Caledonia Rd.,
Toronto 10.
- Ferguson, W. K., 1061 Waterloo St.,
London.
- Fergusson, C. B., Public Archives of
Nova Scotia, Halifax.
- * **Fieldhouse, H. N., McGill Uni-
versity, Montreal.**
- Firestone, O. J., 243 Springfield Rd.,
Ottawa.
- Flemington, Frank, The Ryerson Press,
299 Queen St. W., Toronto 2.
- Flenley, Ralph, Summerfield, Parkgate,
Wirrall, Cheshire, Eng.
- Fleurent, Rév. Père Maurice, Séminaire
de Nicolet, Nicolet, P.Q.
- Flower, G. E., Ontario College of Educa-
tion, 371 Bloor St. W., Toronto 5.
- Foley, Allen R., Dept. of History, Dart-
mouth C., Hanover, N.H.
- Forsey, Eugene, 100 Argyle Ave., Ottawa.
- Fox, P. W., 273 Bloor St. W., Toronto 5.
- Fraser, Miss Barbara, 313 Runnymede
Rd., Toronto 9.
- Frégault, Guy, U. d'Ottawa, Ottawa.
- French, Goldwin, McMaster U., Hamilton,
Ont.
- Frind, H. O., Apt. 1110 Mulock House,
105 Isabella St., Toronto 5.
- Froats, C. S., 82 Gloucester St., Ottawa.
- Galarneau, Claude, U. Laval, Québec,
P.Q.
- Galbraith, J. S., U. of California, Los
Angeles 24, Calif.
- Gallagher, Mrs. E. J., 10573 Blossom
Lake Drive, Largo, Fla.
- Gallagher, Paul, 3465 Durocher, Montréal
18.
- Garner, John, 215 Waverley St., Ottawa 4.
- Gartz, V. E., 1321 Sherbrooke St. W.,
Montreal 25.
- Gates, Mrs. P. W., Dept. of History,
Cornell U., Ithaca, N.Y.
- Gibbard, J. E., 7607 Yukon St., Vancou-
ver 15.
- Gibbons, A. O., 318 Lisgar Rd., Ottawa 2.
- Gibson, F. W., Queen's U., Kingston, Ont.
- Gibson, J. A., 211 Cunningham Ave.,
Ottawa.
- Gibson, Jim, 107 Hope River Rd., Chill-
iwack, B.C.
- Giguère, Rév Père G. E., 1180, rue
Bleury, Montréal.
- Gilpin, J. C., 493 A. Parkside Drive,
Toronto 3.
- Glass, Ogden, Bishop's College School,
Lennoxville, P.Q.
- Glasford, Mrs. Ross, 121 Macpherson
Ave., Toronto 5.
- Glover, R. G., U. of Manitoba, Winnipeg.
- Gluek, A. G., History Dept., Michigan
State U., East Lansing, Mich.
- Goldenberg, H. C., 804 Dominion Square
Bldg., Montreal.
- Goodsell, J. N., Village St., Millis, Mass.
- Gordon, H. S., Carleton U., Ottawa.
- Gordon, Robert S., Public Archives, Ot-
tawa.
- Goss, D. A., 3437 Portnall Ave., Regina.
- Gouin, Jacques, 59 Pharand Place, Hull,
P.Q.
- Graham, W. R., Dept. of History, U. of
Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.
- Grantham, Ronald, Editorial Dept., Ot-
tawa Citizen, Ottawa.
- Gravel, C. E., 3650 rue McTavish,
Montreal.
- Gray, John, 60 Woodlawn Ave., W.,
Toronto.

- Gray, L. R., Hillcrest Dr., R.R. 4, London, Ont.
- Griffiths, E. R. M., 3015 Sherbrooke, Apt. 302, Montreal.
- Guillet, E. C., 736 O'Connor Dr., Toronto 6.
- Guimond, Maj. Georges, Musée militaire, La Citadelle, Québec.
- Gundy, H. P., Queen's U., Kingston, Ont.
- Hale, R. W., 352 Hammond St., Chestnut Hill 67, Mass.
- Halpenny, Miss F. G., U. of Toronto Press, Toronto 5.
- Hamil, F. C., 831 Madison Ave., Birmingham, Mich.
- Hamilton, W. B., P.O. Box 159, Pugwash, N.S.
- Hanrahan, T. J., C.S.B., 4620 W., 2nd Ave., Vancouver.
- Harding, A. W., P.O. Box 4, Ancaster, Ont.
- Hardy, Lucien, C. Saint-Boniface, Saint-Boniface, Man.
- Hare, J. E., 320 St. Cyrville St. W., Quebec.
- Harnetty, P., Dept. of History, U. of British Columbia, Vancouver 8.
- Harris & Partners Ltd., 55 Yonge St., Toronto 1.
- Harris, R. I., 609 Medical Arts Bldg., St. George St. at Bloor, Toronto.
- Harrison, Eric, 505 Annandale, Kingston, Ont.
- Harry, A. C., Barrister, Sault Ste Marie, Ont.
- Harvey, D. C., Public Archives of Nova Scotia, Halifax.
- Healey, Rev. J. E., s.j., Loyola C., 7141 Sherbrooke St. W., Montreal 28.
- Hebert, Miss Lilianne, Assist. Sec., Can. Hist. Ass'n., Public Archives, Ottawa.
- Heick, W. H., 2617 Chapel Hill Rd., Durham, N.C.
- Heisler, J. P., Public Archives, Ottawa.
- Held, C. H., 13117 Veronica Dr., Wyandotte, Mich.
- Henderson, George, Wilton, Ont.
- Herbert, J., 23 Wellington Place, Calgary.
- Herridge, H. W., M.P., Rm. 607, House of Commons, Ottawa.
- Hertzman, Louis, Dept. of History, U. of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Hill, A. S. H., 85 Church St. S., Richmond Hill, Ont.
- Hislop, Miss Edna, Canadian Telephone Employees Ass'n., Rm. 410, 77 York St., Toronto.
- Hitchins, F. H., 140 Kenilworth St., Ottawa.
- Hitsman, J. Mackay, Dept. of National Defence, Ottawa.
- Hodgetts, A. B., Camp Hurontario, Box 52, Port Hope, Ont.
- Hodgins, B. W., Dept. of History, Prince of Wales C., Charlottetown.
- Horn, N. E., 387 Sunnyside Ave., Toronto 3.
- Houston, Miss M. J., U. of Toronto Press, Toronto 5.
- Howell, B. A., P.O. Box 46, St. Andrew's E., P.Q.
- Hoy, Col. C.N., D.S.O., c/o Roodekuil Estate, Box 11, P.O. Warmbaths, Transvaal, S.A.
- Hubbard, R. H., National Gallery, Ottawa.
- Hume, R. D., P.O. Box 1285, Station "B", Ottawa.
- Humphries, J. V., School District No. 6., Kootenay Lake, Kaslo, B.C.
- Hunter, Lt.-Col. T. M., Historical Section, Army HQ., Ottawa.
- Innes, Campbell, M.A., Hon. Supt. Fort Battleford, National Historic Park, Battleford, Sask.
- Innis, D. Q., Queen's U., Kingston, Ont.
- Ireland, W. E., 132 Moss St., Victoria, B.C.
- Irvine, Brian, 18 Oakland Ave., Welland, Ont.
- Jaenen, C. J., 254 Belvidere St., Winnipeg 12.
- Jarvis, Miss Julia, 3 Sussex Ave., Toronto 5.
- Johnson, F. H., 4746 W. 6th Ave., Vancouver 8.
- Johnston, J. G., Northern Ontario Bldg., Toronto 2.
- Johnston, R. A. A., c/o E. B. Johnston, 105 Old Forest Hill Rd., Toronto 10.
- Johnston, Mrs. Wyndham, 5 Newholm Rd., Apt. 203, Toronto 14.
- Jones, Mrs. Constance, 1910 Haig Dr., Ottawa.
- Jones, H. F., M.P., House of Commons, Ottawa.
- Jones, R. L., Marietta C., Marietta, Ohio.
- Kage, Joseph, 4221 Esplanade Ave., Montreal.

- Kashtan, David, 25 Gilgorm Rd., Toronto 12.
- Kautz, Arthur P., History Dept. Valparaiso U., Valparaiso, Ind.
- Kelley, Canon A. R., 4127 Wilson Ave., Montreal 28.
- Kennerley, Miss Olga, 119 Powell Ave., Apt. 3, Ottawa 1.
- Kerr, D. G. G., 301 St. George St., Apt. 311, London, Ont.
- Kesterton, W. H., Carleton U., Ottawa.
- Keyserlingk, R. H., 198 Côte St. Antoine, Westmount, P.Q.
- Kilbourn, W. M., 39 Elgin St., Dundas, Ont.
- Kinchen, O. A., Texas Technological C., Lubbock, Tex.
- King, R. C., 266 Islington Ave. N., Islington, Ont.
- Kirkwood, D. H., P.O. Box 36, Preston, Ont.
- Kirkwood, K. P., 99 Cartier St. Apt. 604, Ottawa.
- Knight, H. C., 11 Cedar Ave., Pointe Claire, P.Q.
- Knowles, David C., P.O. Box 212, Station "D", Ottawa.
- Koerner, W. C., 1203 Matthews Ave., Vancouver.
- Koester, C. B., 87 Angus Cresc., Regina.
- Kress, Irvin, 23 Fairweather Rd., Toronto 15.
- Kula, Sam, 5497 Trans Island Ave., Montreal.
- LaBerge, Lionel, 6385 Avenue Royale, L'Ange-Gardien, Montmorency, P.Q.
- Lajeunesse, E. J., Assumption U., Windsor, Ont.
- * **Lamb, W. Kaye, Dominion Archivist, Public Archives, Ottawa.**
- Lambert, Hon. N. P., The Senate, Ottawa.
- Lamontagne, Leopold, Royal Military C., Kingston, Ont.
- LaPierre, Laurier L., c/o Mme T. Poitras, 760 est, Grande Allée, Québec.
- Laplante, Jean de, 10360 Tolhurst, Montréal.
- LaTerieux, Marc, C. Sainte-Anne-de-la-Pocatière, Sainte-Anne-de-la-Pocatière, P.Q.
- Lavers, James F., Box 787, Lacombe, Alta.
- Lawn, R. J., c/o Carleton Place High School, Carleton Place, Ont.
- Lawrence, J. C., Dept. of English, U. of British Columbia, Vancouver 8.
- Leddy, J. F., Dean of Arts & Science, U. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.
- Lefebvre, J. J., Archiviste, Palais de Justice, Montréal.
- Leith, J. A., Dept. of History, U. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.
- Leland, Miss Marine, Smith C., Northampton, Mass.
- LePine, Rev. J. J., Campion C., Regina.
- Lermer, Arthur, Sir George Williams C., Montreal.
- Levadie, Meyer, 225 MacLaren St., Apt. 43, Ottawa.
- Levine, A. L., Dept. of Econ., U. of New Brunswick, Fredericton, N.B.
- Lightbody, C. W., U. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.
- Lindsay, J. Kennedy, Dept. of History, U. of South Carolina, Columbia, S.C.
- Lingard, C. C., 2313 Carling Ave., Ottawa 3.
- Lockwood, P. A., Mount Allison U., Sackville, N.B.
- Loggie, Miss Isabel, Paddle Prairie, Alta.
- Long, Mrs. E. E., 17 Lytton Blvd., Toronto 12.
- Longley, R. S., Acadia University, Wolfville, N.S.
- Longstaff, Maj. F. V., 50 King George Terrace, Victoria, B.C.
- Lovekin, James, 12 Pine Ridge Dr., Toronto 13.
- Lovell, Colin Rhys., U. of Southern California, Los Angeles 7, Calif.
- Luxton, Miss Eleanor G., High River, Alta.
- Lynch-Staunton, John, 3500 Atwater Ave., Apt. 106, Montreal 25.
- McCarter, W. K., 3507 Cadboro Bay Rd., Victoria, B.C.
- McCloy, T. R., 1202 — 6th St., S.W., Calgary.
- McClure, W. H., P.O. Box 543, Saginaw, Mich.
- McConica, J. K., Dept. of History, U. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.
- McCready, H. W., McMaster University, Hamilton.
- McCulley, Joseph, Hart House, U. of Toronto, Toronto 5.
- McCullough, E. E., 1441 Drummond St., Montreal.
- McCutcheon, M. W., Taylor, McDougald & Co., 15 King St. W., Toronto.

- MacDonald, John A., M.P., Cardigan, P.E.I.
- McDougall, D. J., Dept. of History, U. of Toronto, Toronto 5.
- McDougall, W. D., Faculty of Education, U. of Alberta, Edmonton.
- MacFarlane, R. O., Carleton U., Ottawa.
- McGee, Frank, M.P., House of Commons, Ottawa.
- McGibbon, D. W., Imperial Oil Bldg., Treasurer's Dept., 11 St. Clair W., Toronto.
- MacGowan, S. D., 820 Levis Ave., Apt. 7., Quebec 6.
- McGurn, J. E., 2 Castle Park, Rochester 20, N.Y.
- McIlwraith, T. F., Royal Ontario Museum, Toronto.
- McInnes, Edgar, Can. Instit. of Internat. Affairs, 230 Bloor St. W., Toronto 5.
- MacIver, A. F., Box 98, Churchill, Mann.
- McKay, Mrs. A. S., 5635 Hazen St., Houston 36, Tex.
- Mackay, B. R., 193 Carling Ave., Ottawa.
- MacKay, Miss E. M., 19 Tranby Ave., Toronto 5.
- McKee, Miss Marguerite, Assist. Sec., Can. Hist. Ass'n., Public Archives, Ottawa.
- MacKellar, Mrs. P. E., 28 Belvedere Rd., Montreal 6.
- Mackenzie, N. A. M., U. of British Columbia, Vancouver 8.
- MacKinnon, Frank, Principal, Prince of Wales C., Charlottetown, P.E.I.
- Mackintosh, W. A., Queen's U., Kingston, Ont.
- MacKirdy, K. A., Dept. of History, U. of Washington, Seattle, Wash.
- MacLaren, C. H., 14 Metcalfe St., Ottawa.
- McLaughlin, J. P., 124 St. James St., Apt. 102, London, Ont.
- MacLean, G. R., Dalhousie U., Dept. of History, Halifax.
- MacLeod, Mrs. M. A., 138 Maryland St., Winnipeg.
- MacNab, J. E., St. Lawrence U., Canton, N.Y.
- McNaught, K. W., Dept. of History, U. of Toronto, Toronto 5.
- MacNaughton, Miss K. F., 3 Victoria St., Campbellton, N.B.
- McNeal, R. H., Dept. of History, U. of Alberta, Edmonton.
- MacNeil, Rev. E. J., St. Michael's C., Bay & St. Joseph Sts., Toronto.
- MacNutt, W. S., U. of New Brunswick, Fredericton, N.B.
- McOuat, D. F., 1316 Ambleside Dr., Box 128, Lorne Park, Ont.
- MacQuarrie, H. N., M.P., Victoria, P.E.I.
- Major, T. G., Commercial Counsellor for Canada, 83 William St., Melbourne, Australia.
- Malchelosse, Gerard, 5759 Ave Durocher, Outremont, P.Q.
- Mallory, J. R., McGill U., Montreal.
- Maltby, P. L., 1066 Yonge St., Toronto.
- Manning, Mrs. H. T., Bryn Mawr C., Bryn Mawr, Pa.
- Manning, John, 340 Morrill Hall, Michigan State U., East Lansing, Mich.
- Mantha, Hector, 65 rue Milton, Montréal 18.
- Martin, G. H., 274 Holmwood Ave., Ottawa.
- Massey, His Excellency Rt. Hon. Vincent, Governor General of Canada, Ottawa.
- Mast, J. H., 107 Byron Rd., Pittsburgh 37, Pa.
- Masters, D. C., Bishop's U., Lennoxville, P.Q.
- Matheson, Thomas, Public Archives, Ottawa.
- Maurault, Mgr Olivier, 116 Notre-Dame Ouest, Montréal 26.
- Mealing, S. R., Carleton U., Ottawa.
- Meisel, John, Queen's U., Kingston, Ont.
- Metcalf, George, 22 Rosemary Lane, Toronto.
- Metcalf, W. C., 12 Cortleigh Blvd., Toronto 12.
- Miller, Harry, 63 Merton Rd., Hampstead, Montreal.
- Miller, T. B., Lakehead College, P.O. Box 1166, Port Arthur, Ont.
- Mitchell, Harvey, Archivist-Historian, Memorial U. of Nfld., St. John's, Nfld.
- Mitchener, R. D., Chief, Higher Education Section, Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Ottawa.
- Moore, H. E., Hotel Yates, 712 Yates St., Victoria, B.C.
- Morgan, M. O., Dept. of Econ. & Pol. Sc., Memorial U. of Nfld., St. John's, Nfld.
- Morin, R.P. Conrad M., O.F.M., Bibl. et Archiviste Provincial, 2010 ouest Dorchester, Montréal 25.
- Morin, Victor, 34 rue Saint-Jacques ouest, Montréal.

- Morisset, Gérard, 1185 ave Brown, app. 4, Québec.
- Morris, A. Y., 400 Second Ave., Apt. 6., Ottawa.
- Morris, Edmund, M.P., House of Commons, Ottawa.
- Morrison, Major J. C., 10 Bedford Cres., Manor Park, Ottawa 2.
- Morrison, K. L., R.R. 1, Cardinal, Ont.
- Morrison, Neil, C.B.C., 140 Wellington St., Ottawa.
- Morton, W. L., U. of Manitoba, Winnipeg.
- Muir, Robert, M.P., 107 Shore Rd., Sydney Mines, N.S.
- Mullally, Emmet J., 2021 Union Ave., Montréal.
- Muller, Steven, Dept. of Government, Cornell U., Ithaca, N.Y.
- Mulvihill, Rev. D. J., Assumption U., Windsor, Ont.
- Munroe, D. C., Macdonald C., Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue, P.Q.
- Murphy, Miss Ethel, Box 145, Clarkson, Ont.
- Murray, A. L., Rm. 208, College Hall, U. of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 41, Pa.
- Murray, Miss J. E., U. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.
- Murray, Miss Lucy H., Regina C., Regina.
- Murray, W. H., 36 Church Hill, Westmount, P.Q.
- Mutchmor, Rev. J. R., 299 Queen St. W., Toronto.
- Mylrea, A. J., c/o Reed, Shaw & McNaught, 25 Adelaide St. W., Toronto.
- Nadeau, Gabriel, Rutland State San., Rutland, Mass.
- Neatby, H. B., Laurier House, 335 Laurier St. E., Ottawa.
- Neatby, Miss H. R., U. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.
- Neilson, Miss J. M., 8 Haddon St., Toronto 12.
- Nelson, G. F., P.O. Box 134, Iles de Laval, P.Q.
- Nelson, H. I., Dept. of History, U. of Toronto, Toronto 5.
- Nelson, J. R., Prime Minister's office, Ottawa.
- Nicholson, Col. G. W. L., 1101 Bronson Ave., Ottawa.
- Norris, J. M., Dept. of History, U. of British Columbia, Vancouver 8.
- O'Brien, C. P., 5261 Ponsard Ave., Montreal 29.
- Ogelsby, J. C. M., Dept. of History, U. of Washington, Seattle 5.
- Oglesby, Major R. B., 1237 avenue Forget, Sillery, Québec 6.
- O'Keefe, Rev., C. B., s.j., Saint Mary's U., Halifax.
- Oleson, Tryggvi, U. of Manitoba, Winnipeg.
- Oliver, Michael, United C., Winnipeg.
- Ormsby, Miss M. A., U. of British Columbia, Vancouver 8.
- Ormsby, W. G., Public Archives, Ottawa.
- Ouellet, Fernand, Archiviste-adjoint, 445, rue Learmonth, Apt. 2, Québec.
- Overend, H. J., 11 Albert St. S., Orillia, Ont.
- Parizeau, Gérard, 10, avenue Glencoe, Outremont, P.Q.
- Park, F. W., 484 Church St., Apt. 1109, Toronto.
- Paterson, J. S., 67 Centre St. N., Brampton, Ont.
- Patterson, F. H., Truro, N.S.
- Patterson, R., 927 Woodstock Place, Montreal.
- Pearce, C. W., 103 Booth Bldg., 165 Sparks St., Ottawa.
- Peardon, T. P., Columbia U., New York, N.Y.
- Pearson, Hon. L. B., M.P., 409-s, House of Commons, Ottawa.
- Peers, F. W., C.B.C., Talks & Public Affairs, 354 Jarvis St., Toronto 5.
- Pendergast, Rev. R. A., St. John Fisher C., Rochester 18, N.Y.
- Penlington, Norman, Dept. of Humanities, Michigan State University, East Lansing, Mich.
- Pentland, H. C., U. of Manitoba, Winnipeg.
- Perry, J. H., 47 Heathcote Ave., Willowdale, Ont.
- Peters, R., 58 Hastie Ave., Apt. 2, Ottawa.
- Peterson, Thomas, 4M Blake Gardens, Winnipeg 3.
- Petrie, A. E. H., Public Archives, Ottawa.
- Pherrill, Raymond, 106 Marchmount Rd., Toronto.
- Phillips, A. T., 457 Forest Ave., West Kildonan, Winnipeg 4.
- Picard, L., 36 Hadley St., Hull, P.Q.
- Pickersgill, Hon. J. W., House of Commons, Ottawa.

- Pitfield, Michael, Saraguay Hall, Saraguay, Montreal.
- Plant, R. J., 3024 Breslay Rd., Montreal 6.
- Pollard, S. L., 10961 Esplanade Ave., Montreal 12.
- Potvin, M. l'abbé Pascal, Ecole Normale, 25, rue Déziel, Lévis, P.Q.
- Pouliot, R.P., Adrien, s.j., 14, rue Dauphine, Québec.
- Prang, Miss M. E., Dept. of History, U. of British Columbia, Vancouver.
- Pratt, R. John, M.P., House of Commons, Ottawa.
- Preston, A. W., Bishop's University, Lennoxville, P.Q.
- Preston, R. A., Royal Military C., Kingston, Ont.
- Price, Major General C. B., P.O. Box 277, Fayrethead, Knowlton, P.Q.
- Pullen, Rear-Admiral H. F., 15 Lorne Terrace, Halifax.
- Purdy, J. D., Pickering C., Newmarket, Ont.
- Raddall, T. H., 44 Park St., Liverpool, N.S.
- Rasch, Otto, Bahnhofstrasse 5, Marburg/Lahn, Germany.
- Raymond, Raoul, 8960, rue Saint-Denis, Montréal 11.
- Reeves-Morache, Mme Marcelle, 3449, ave Belmore, N.D.G., Montréal 28.
- Reid, J. H. S., Rm. 205, 77 Metcalfe St., Ottawa.
- Reid, W. Stanford, McGill U., Montreal.
- Reynolds, Ralph, Canadian Embassy, 4 Trondhjems Plads, Copenhagen, Denmark.
- Riddell, W. A., 76 Douglas Dr., Toronto 5.
- Rife, C. W., 1689 Hewitt Ave., St. Paul 4, Minn.
- Rintoul, C. P., Box 145, Victoria Harbour, Ont.
- Rintoul, D. G., 192 Redpath Ave., Toronto 12.
- Ritchie, R. S., c/o Imperial Oil Ltd., 111 St. Clair Ave. W., Toronto.
- Robbins, J. E., 661 Island Park Dr., Ottawa.
- Robertson, Mrs. Duncan, 134 Humbercrest Blvd., Toronto 9.
- Rodney, William, 14 Portnalls Rd., Coulsdon, Surrey, England.
- Roe, F. G., 2547 Killarney Rd., Cadboro Bay, Victoria, B.C.
- Rolland, H. J., 605, rue Lapointe, Ville Saint-Laurent, Montréal.
- Rollit, J. B., Rm. E-201, C.P.R., Windsor Station, Montreal.
- Rose, Wm. J., Naramata, B.C.
- Rosenberg, L., 493 Sherbrooke St., W., Montreal 2.
- Rosenfeld, W. P., St. Antony's C., Oxford, England.
- Ross, Sam G., 196 Kamloops St., R.R. 5, Ottawa.
- Ross, Miss Vernon, Library School, McGill U., Montreal.
- Rothney, G. O., Memorial U. of Newfoundland, St. John's, Nfld.
- Rouleau, Jean-Noël, Directeur du Dept. d'Histoire, Collège Militaire Royal de Saint-Jean, Saint-Jean, P.Q.
- Roy, I. H., 73 Renfrew St., Pembroke, Ont.
- Roy, Reg. H., 3825 Merriman Dr., Victoria, B.C.
- Roy, Miss S. F. B., 239 Glenview Ave., Toronto 12.
- Russell, E. C., 516 Blair St., Ottawa.
- Russell, Mrs. Margaret, 2029 Allen Place, Washington 9, D.C.
- Rutherford, W. D., Board of Trade, 60 Charlotte St., Brantford, Ont.
- Ryerson, S. B., 157 Dunn Ave., Toronto.
- Rynard, P. B., M.P., M.D., House of Commons, Ottawa.
- Salmon, E. T., Dept. of History, McMaster U., Hamilton.
- Samuel, Sigmund, 104 Forest Hill Rd., Toronto.
- Saucier, Roger, 230 est avenue des Saules, Québec 3.
- Saunders, R. E., 397 Manor Rd. E., Toronto 7.
- Saunders, S. A., 350 St. Clair Ave. W., Apt. L., Toronto.
- Savage, D. C., 4071 Grand Blvd., Montreal 28.
- Sawdon, W. B., P.O. Box 639, Sackville, N.B.
- Saywell, J. T., Dept. of History, U. of Toronto, Toronto 5.
- Schioler, J. P., Corpus Christi C., Oxford, England.
- Schneider, F. D., Vanderbilt U., Nashville 5, Tenn.
- Schull, Joseph, Saint-Eustache-sur-le-Lac, P.Q.
- Schultz, H. J., Dept. of History, Stetson U., DeLand, Fla.
- Schurman, D. M., Box 177, Reddendale, Ont.

- Schuyler, R. L., The Century Association,
7 West Forty-third St., New York 36,
N.Y.
- Schwarzenberger, Francis, Faculty of
Arts, U. of Ottawa, Ottawa.
- Scott, F. R., McGill U., Montreal.
- Self, G. M., U. of Alberta, Calgary.
- Senior, H., Memorial U. of Newfound-
land, St. John's, Nfld.
- Shadd, D. T. W., Public Archives, Ottawa.
- Shkwarok, W. F., P.O. Box 314, Castlegar,
B.C.
- Sider, E. M., Nanticoke, Ont.
- Simpson, G. W., U. of Saskatchewan,
Saskatoon.
- Sinn, H. L., 1106 West Orchard, Inde-
pendence, Mo.
- Sissons, C. B., Newcastle, Ont.
- Sissons, J. N., 204 Glenrose Ave., Toronto.
- Sister Mary Jean, Saint Mary-of-the-
Woods C., Terre Haute, Indiana.
- Sister M. Louis, St. Bride's C., Little-
dale, St. John's, Nfld.
- Sister St. Amelia, C.N.D., St. Augustine
Convent, 5456 Côte St. Antoine Rd.,
Montreal 28.
- Slater, E. H., 490 Grosvenor St., London,
Ont.
- Small, Mrs. A. D., Canadian Embassy,
Zitelmannstrasse 22, Bonn, Germany.
- Smith, D. L., Dept. of History, Miami
University, Oxford, Ohio.
- Smith, E. F. S., P.O. Box 123, Hudson
Heights, P.Q.
- Smith, Gaddis, Dept. of History, Duke
U., Durham, N.C.
- Smith, G. H., 221 Alexandra St., Port
Colborne, Ont.
- Smith, G. W., Collège Militaire Royal,
St. John's, P.Q.
- Smith, H. Greville, Canadian Industries
Ltd., Box 10, Montreal.
- Smith, Miss Marion B., Dept. of English,
U. of British Columbia, Vancouver 8.
- Smith, Murray, M.P., House of Com-
mons, Ottawa.
- Smith, S. G. D., University C., Oxford,
England.
- Smith, W. D., Brandon C., Brandon,
Man.
- Smith, Rev. W. E. L., Queen's Theolo-
gical C., Kingston, Ont.
- Smith, Wilfred, Public Archives, Ottawa.
- Soberlak, Johnny, 4302 W — 9th, Van-
couver.
- Sotiroff, George, 2149 Lorne St., Regina.
- Spencer, R. A., Dept. of History, U. of
Toronto, Toronto.
- Splane, R. B., 1326 Laperriere, Ottawa 3.
- Spooner, C. M., Rm. 352, 3rd Floor,
Toronto Western Hospital, Toronto 2B.
- Spragge G. W., Dept. of Archives, Par-
liament Bldgs., Toronto.
- Spry, Mrs. Graham, 28 Chester St.,
London S.W.1, England.
- * **Stanley, G. F. G., Royal Military
C., Kingston, Ont.**
- Stevens, Lt.-Col. G. R., 144 Strathearn
Ave., Montreal Ouest.
- Stevenson, A. A., 4022 Oxford Ave.,
Montreal.
- Stewart, Miss A. R., U. of Maine, Orono,
Me.
- Stewart, Russell, P.O. Box 689, Thorn-
hill, Ont.
- Story, Miss Norah, Public Archives,
Ottawa.
- Stovel, H. V., 1010 St. Catherine St. W.,
Montreal 2.
- Strikwerda, Earl, Dept. of History, Calvin
C., Grand Rapids 6., Mich.
- Sutherland, J. K., College of Education,
U. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.
- Sutherland, Neil, 3325 West — 34th
Ave., Vancouver 13.
- Swainson, N. A., Victoria C., Victoria,
B.C.
- Symons, T. H. B., U. of Toronto,
Residence for Men, 3 Devonshire
Place, Toronto 5.
- * **Talman, J. J., U. of Western
Ontario, London, Ont.**
- Tanchak, N., 133 Mossdale Ave., Win-
nipeg 5, Man.
- Taylor, J., 103 Westland Ave., Rochester
18, N.Y.
- Temple, A. D., Ste. Anne's Hospital,
Sainte-Anne-de-Bellevue, P.Q.
- Thatcher, M. B., U. of Connecticut,
Storrs, Conn.
- Thomas, L. G., U. of Alberta, Edmon-
ton.
- Thomas, L. H., Regina C., Regina.
- Thompson, F. F., Dept. of History, Royal
Military C., Kingston, Ont.
- Thorburn, H. G., Queen's U., Kingston,
Ont.
- Thorpe, F. J., 45 Somerset St. W., Apt.
21, Ottawa.
- Tipp, C., Central Baptist Seminary, 225
St. George St., Toronto 5.
- Todd, R. M., Public Archives, Ottawa.

- Tolmie, M. M., Dept. of History, Mount Allison U., Sackville, N.B.
- Tomkins, G. S., 188 — 52nd Ave., Lachine, P.Q.
- Totton, S. J., 25 Hollinger Rd., Toronto 16.
- Trudeau, M. R., 1197, rue University, Montreal.
- Tucker, A. V., J 31 Dunster House, Harvard U., Cambridge, Mass.
- Tufnell, W. G., 74 Haynes Ave., St. Catharines, Ont.
- Turner, A. R., Archives Division, Legislative Library, Regina.
- Turner, A. C., U. of California, Riverside, Calif.
- Turp, F. J., 71 Cannon Rd., Toronto 18.
- Ullman, Walter, Canadian Studies Program, Dept. of History, U. of Rochester, Rochester, N.Y.
- Ulmer, A., 534-E. — 17th Ave., Vancouver.
- Vachon, André, Archives de la Province, Secrétariat de la Province, Québec.
- Van Alstyne, R. W., U. of Southern California, Los Angeles, Calif.
- Vanasse, A. R., 6 Locke St., Saco, Maine.
- Vernon, Hugh, 287 St. Leonard's Ave., Toronto 12.
- Vogel, R., 5809 Coolbrook St., Montreal.
- Voisine, Nive, ptre., Séminaire, Rimouski, P.Q.
- Vollmar, Rev. E. R., St. Louis U., 221 N. Grand Blvd., St. Louis 3, Mo.
- Wade, Mason, 409 Rush Rhees Library, U. of Rochester, Rochester 20, N.Y.
- Waines, W. J., U. of Manitoba, Winnipeg.
- Waite, Peter, Dept. of History, Dalhousie U., Halifax.
- Waldon, Miss Freda, 36 Robinson St., Hamilton, Ont.
- Walker, F. N., 218 Inglewood Dr., Toronto 7.
- Walker, L. D., 406 St. Clements Ave., Toronto 12.
- Wallace, Miss E., 13 Washington Ave., Toronto.
- Walmsley, N. E., Dept. of Pol. Sc., Brandon C., Brandon, Man.
- Walter, T. D., 2442 Gladstone Ave., Windsor, Ont.
- Ward, F. G., 2137 Bel Air Dr., Ottawa.
- Warkentin, J. H., Dept. of Geography, United C., Winnipeg 2.
- Warner, D. F., Wisconsin State C., Eau Claire, Wis.
- Watson, Lt. P. H., Wardroom, *H.M.C.S. Stadacona*, Halifax.
- Webster, T. S., Dept. of History, U. of Manitoba, Winnipeg.
- Weilbrenner, Bernard, Public Archives, Ottawa.
- Weir, S. E., Canadian Bank of Commerce Bldg., London, Ont.
- White, Miss M. E., Trinity C., Toronto, Ont.
- White, P. C. T., Dept. of History, U. of Toronto, Toronto 5.
- Whitelaw, W. M., 39 Mapledell St., Springfield, Mass.
- Whittard, Miss B. N., 19 Syke Ings, Iver, Bucks, England.
- Whitton, W. R., General Delivery, Kemptville, Ont.
- Wilkinson, B., Dept. of History, U. of Toronto, Toronto 5.
- Williams, Chief Justice E. K., Law Courts, Winnipeg.
- Willms, A. M., Public Archives, Ottawa.
- Willoughby, Wm. R., R.R. 1, Canton, N.Y.
- Wills, H. A., c/o Northland Post, Box 110, Cochrane, Ont.
- Wilson, Miss B. M., Public Archives, Ottawa.
- Wilson, C. P., Glenbow Foundation, Calgary.
- Windsor, K. N., London House, Guilford St., London, W.C. 1, Eng.
- Winks, R. W., Dept. of History, Yale U., New Haven, Conn.
- Winter, C. G., 126 — 43rd St., Sacramento 19, Calif.
- Wirick, A. J., Extension Dept., U. of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon.
- Wise, S. F., Dept. of History, Queen's U., Kingston, Ont.
- Wishart, Rev. I. S., 8 Powell Ave., Toronto 5.
- Wolff, C. M., P.O. Box 413, Arnprior, Ont.
- Woods, H. D., Indust. Rel. Centre, 1020 Pine Ave., Montreal.
- Wright, Aubrey W., Botwood, Gander District, Nfld.
- Wright, Peter, R.R. 1, King, Ont.
- Wurtele, D. J., Public Archives, Ottawa.
- Wynne, R. E., Dept. of History, U. of Washington, Seattle 5, Wash.

- Young, D. M., Dept. of History, U. of
New Brunswick, Fredericton.
- Young, J. C., Encyclopedia Canadiana,
311 Richmond Rd., Ottawa.
- Young, W. D., Dept. of Pol. Sc., U. of
Manitoba, Winnipeg.
- Younge, Eva, 3600 University St., Mont-
real 2.
- Zacour, Norman P., Dept of History,
Franklin and Marshall Co., Lancaster,
Pa.
- Zaslow, Morris, U. of Toronto, Toronto
5.

(35) 5 271-4-O.F.

Date Due

[illegible]

TRENT UNIVERSITY



0 1164 0194734 0

F5000 .C26 1959

Canadian Historical Assoc
Rapport...

RESERVE

42022

Reserve:

42022

